

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 27, 1875.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT we made some weeks ago that the state of Mr. Justice Honyman's health was such as to render it improbable that he would resume his judicial duties, and that he was likely to be succeeded in the Court of Common Pleas by Mr. J. W. Huddleston, Q.C., has proved accurate. The new judge, as one of the leaders of the common law bar, will, at all events, bring to his duties a large experience in business at Nisi Prius.

LORD SELBORNE, in his elaborate criticisms of the alterations in the Land Transfer Bill on Tuesday evening, put the case for the general establishment of district registries quite as strongly as we have stated it. "Another objection," he said, "of his noble and learned friend had reference to the difficulty of establishing a sufficient number of registries. It would be necessary, no doubt, to have in London a highly-qualified body of examiners, and it might be desirable that some of them should go at times into the country; but their services were not needed in the case of the small local transactions to which he was now referring. He could not help thinking the difficulty was imaginary, for there were at present local registries of various kinds throughout the country which might be utilized for the purpose now under consideration. In dealing only with the registration of possessory titles and of subsequent transfers, the rules prescribed would be so simple that, for his part, he could see no reason why existing registries should not be intrusted with the duty. Whether the transactions were numerous or not, the registrars would probably be found ready to undertake the work for the sake of the fees. There were, indeed, respectable solicitors who would do it for the sake merely of the position and credit it would bring them." In these observations, however, one consideration seems to have been overlooked, and it is that, compulsion being abandoned, it has become doubly necessary to the success of the measure that every inducement should be offered to landowners to avail themselves of its provisions. There is, as Lord Selborne pointed out, a natural adherence to old practices, which should, however, be combated, not, as his lordship suggested, by riding roughshod over prejudices and compelling the adoption of a wholly untried scheme, but by rendering its adoption easy and inexpensive. Can any one seriously imagine that purchasers in Cumberland or Cornwall will be tempted to go to Lincoln's-inn to be registered as possessory owners, with the prospect of having to go there on all subsequent dealings with the legal title? But supposing a registry to be established at Carlisle or Truro, the purchaser and his solicitor will be constantly reminded of the advantages attending the acquisition of a clear title by mere lapse of time; the solicitor will be able to point out to his client that a very certain gain may be secured for a very trifling cost; the district registrar, being paid by fees, will naturally spare no trouble in

doing his work efficiently, and in bringing before landowners the benefits of registration; thus the system may be expected gradually to spread over each county. If it were not for the Treasury prejudices against creating a new class of officers, it would seem too plain for argument that for a scheme of voluntary land registration to succeed it must be localized. Lord Cairns' remark, that "the substitutes proposed for the local registrars would prove very unsatisfactory," seems to need no further reply than by a reference to the analogous case of the steward of a manor. This officer, who, says Lord Coke, is "the judge of copyhold cases, and also a minister and register to enter things into the court rolls," is almost invariably a solicitor. Has Lord Cairns ever heard that the employment of solicitors in this capacity has "proved unsatisfactory?"

WE ARE NOT SURPRISED that the Attorney-General should have expressed an opinion, on the second reading of Mr. Lopes' Bill to amend the Bills of Sale Act, that the third clause would require to be carefully considered in committee. A more absurd provision was probably never laid before Parliament. It proposes to enact that "where any mortgage of, or security or charge on, any personal chattels is hereafter effected without a bill of sale, and is of such a character as that it might have been effected by means of a bill of sale, the said mortgage, security, or charge, whether the same be legal or equitable, shall, unless the requirements hereafter specified are complied with, be null and void," as if it were an unregistered bill of sale. The requirements (clause 4) consist of the filing of a statement of particulars of the names, &c., of mortgagor and mortgagee, the date of the mortgage, the amount secured, a description of the mortgaged property, of the places where it is, and the name, &c., of the witness. We pointed out last year (18 S. J. 545) that the effect of the words in italics would be to leave the law exactly as it stands at present. For the question whether a mortgage is "of such a character as that it might have been effected by a bill of sale," obviously depends altogether upon the definition of a bill of sale. Now clause 1 defines a bill of sale by reference to section 7 of the Act of 1854, the interpretation of which by the courts has given rise to the whole difficulty meant to be solved. Why are mortgages of certain personal chattels not at present liable to be registered as bills of sale? Because it has been held that their operation is not such an operation as belongs to any of the instruments enumerated in section 7 of the Act of 1854. That is to say, they are of such a character as that they could not have been effected by means of a bill of sale. Will Mr. Lopes inform the public how this state of things will be altered by the provision of his Bill? What the promoter of the Bill really means is "where any mortgage, security, or charge, whether legal or equitable, is hereafter effected by any instrument of or upon any property which might have been transferred by a bill of sale, such instrument shall be deemed to be a bill of sale unless the same is expressly excepted from bills of sale by section 7 of 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, and shall, &c."

We must also again protest against the confusion which will be occasioned by the double form of registration proposed to be introduced.

WE DO NOT PRESUME to doubt the accuracy of Lord Redesdale's statement that railway companies are under no liability whatever to provide different classes of carriages. There seem, however, to be some indications that such an obligation has been assumed by the Legislature to exist; though it is certainly unfortunate that the provisions relating to the subject should differ so greatly as they do in the case of different railway companies, and be almost entirely contained in special Acts. The general railway Acts give but little information on the subject. "The third-class passenger," indeed, is specially provided.

for by the Cheap Trains Act (7 & 8 Vict. c. 85), s. 6, which "secures to the poorer class of travellers the means of travelling by railway at moderate fares, and in carriages in which they may be protected from the weather." And the 12th section of the same Act entitles officers in the army upon duty to "conveyance in a first-class carriage," and soldiers to conveyance, not in second or third class carriages *eo nomine*, but in "carriages which shall be provided with seats." The Railways Clauses Acts of 1845 and 1863 are absolutely silent as to any distinction of class. The direction, however, of the Railways Regulation Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 119, s. 20), that all railway companies shall provide "smoking compartments for each class of passengers," would seem to contemplate the existence of two, if not three, distinct classes. Turning to special acts, we find very different kinds of provisions. Thus the Great Northern and London and North-Western Railway Companies Acts seem to assume the existence of three classes, having scales of fares graduated according to first, second, and third classes. (See 9 & 10 Vict. c. cclv., ss. 82, 83; c. lxxi., s. 202.) The Great Western and the Midland, on the other hand, may levy threepence halfpenny per mile on every passenger without distinction of class. (See 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. cvii., s. 165; 7 & 8 Vict. c. xviii., ss. 198, 202.) The sample toll clauses of the Lancaster and Carlisle Railway furnished by the Royal Commission upon Railways (Report, p. xiii.), are similarly indiscriminate. Among them is the singular clause that "it shall be lawful for the company to charge any sum which they may think fit in respect of the passengers conveyed by first-class trains appointed by the company to travel at a speed not being less than twenty-five miles in the hour, including stoppages," a clause which was repealed, so far as regards the Lancaster and Carlisle, when that company was amalgamated with the London and North-Western (Report, p. xxx.), but may, for all we know, be found in one or other of the 3,100 "special Acts" in which many of the most important parts of railway legislation are to be found imbedded. "The clauses governing tolls and charges," reported the Royal Commissioners, "which have been left entirely to special Acts, are of a very bald and imperfect character. In some cases Parliament has taken advantage of the amalgamation of companies to bring all their powers into one Act, whilst in other cases the toll clauses are scattered through the numerous separate Acts originally obtained by the companies which have since been amalgamated. . . . The Great Western would appear to have thirteen Acts with toll and rate clauses." Surely, whether Lord Redesdale's suggestion is adopted or not, the "toll and rate clauses" of each railway company ought to be contained in one consolidating Act.

A DECISION OF THE LORDS JUSTICES ON Thursday ought to act as a wholesome warning to receivers in bankruptcy. In the case referred to (*Ex parte Warren*), the facts were that the day before the debtor filed his petition one of his creditors, to whom he had given a bill of sale which had not been registered, took possession of certain chattels on the debtor's premises. On the filing of the petition a receiver was appointed, and the next day, upon the joint application of the debtor and the receiver, an injunction was granted to restrain the creditor from interfering with the assets, the debtor and the receiver undertaking, in the ordinary way, to be answerable to the creditor for any damages which might be occasioned to him by the injunction. At the meeting of the creditors a liquidation by arrangement was resolved upon, and the receiver was appointed trustee. The question as to the right to the chattels seized was ultimately decided in favour of the bill of sale holder. He then applied for an order that the receiver and the debtor should, in pursuance of their undertaking, pay him the damages which he had sustained through

being turned out of possession of the chattels which he had seized. Mr. Registrar Spring-Rice refused to enforce the undertaking, and treated the receiver as being in the same position as a receiver appointed in a chancery suit on behalf of all the parties. The Lords Justices, however, pointed out that the receiver was in no sense the agent of the bill of sale holder, but was on the contrary to be looked upon, as regarded his rights, in the light of a trespasser. They accordingly referred the matter back to the registrar to assess the amount of damages which the receiver was to pay. They remarked that if, as appeared probable in this case, by reason of there being no estate of the debtor, the receiver had to pay the damages out of his own pocket, he had no right to complain, since, before he gave the undertaking, he might have protected himself by insisting upon an indemnity from the creditors. But their lordships refused to make any order against the debtor in respect of his undertaking, upon the ground that the liability resulting from it, having been contracted before the appointment of the trustee, was, under the combined operation of section 31, and section 125, sub-section 7, of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, a liability proveable in the liquidation. Lord Justice Mellish observed that the reason for requiring the undertaking to be given by the debtor as well as by the receiver was that the proceedings under the petition might possibly result neither in a liquidation nor a bankruptcy.

THE PRACTICE of giving refreshers to counsel in Chancery cases in which the hearing occupies more than one day appears likely to become the subject of more general recognition than it has hitherto been. In reviewing the taxing-master's allowances in the case of *Smith v. Buller*, the patent swivel case, Vice-Chancellor Malins expressed his opinion that the distinction which had been drawn between causes in which witnesses were examined, and those in which no witnesses were examined, and the practice of allowing refreshers in the former causes only, appeared to him to be altogether irrational, and not to be supported; and that the true criterion was the time which had been taken up. The old distinction, as to the unreasonableness of which we quite concur in the Vice-Chancellor's observation, probably had its origin in the fact that in causes with witnesses, and as a general rule only in such causes, a common law counsel was usually imported. It has, of course, long been the custom to give daily refreshers at common law, and as appears from *Hill v. Hibbit* (L. R. 14 Eq. 221), by a kind of comity of courts, the equity taxing-masters used to allow common law counsel appearing at Lincoln's-inn the refreshers they were accustomed to at Westminster. This was naturally felt to be rather hard on their fellow counsel, and in the case we have referred to Vice-Chancellor Bacon directed the common law rule to prevail for the benefit of all the counsel engaged in the case. The system of refreshers, which has recently received an important extension in the common law courts by the deliberate judgment of the Court of Common Pleas (see *Laurie v. Wilson*, 23 W. R. 139), is one based on fairness and sound sense; and we shall not be sorry to see it extended to the Court of Chancery.

MR. FORSYTH has done good service in calling attention to the present mode of drawing and passing Acts of Parliament, and we are glad to observe that the Attorney-General has promised that he, or some other member of the Government, will shortly ask for the appointment of a select committee "to inquire into the subject." Mr. Forsyth's proposition, however, that the proper way of amending an Act on an important subject is to repeal it, and to re-enact its provisions in the new Act (which has in some measure the authority of Mr. Justice Blackburn to support it; see *R. v. Smith*, 21 W. R. 303, L. R. 8 Q. B., at p. 150), must, we think, be

accepted with considerable qualifications. The extent of the proposed amendment, the dates of the statutes proposed to be amended, and the nature of the "important subject" should all be considered before it is decided to swell the volume of the year's statutes. There is no doubt that something can be done by the mere examination of each particular Bill, after it is drawn, with the simple purpose of scrutinizing its "accuracy of language, consistency of provisions, and harmony with existing legislation." But this would, after all, only remedy a part of the existing evils. We pointed out some time ago (18 S. J. 316) that the style of drafting Bills has sensibly retrograded, and that, as compared with the Consolidation Acts of thirty years ago, the form of recent legislation is slovenly and careless; and attention should be directed rather to an improvement in the drafting of measures than to their revision when drawn.

A RATHER SINGULAR STATE OF THINGS is indicated by a trustworthy correspondent in a letter which will be found in another column. One of the new Chancery Funds Rules directs that a transcript of the accounts in the books of the Chancery Paymaster in respect of any cause or matter may be issued, and that, "if so required by the person to whom it is issued, such transcript shall be authenticated at the Chancery Audit Office." These last words have been added to the provision on the subject in the rules of 1872, and it appears that they do not meet with the approval of the officials at the Chancery Pay Office. At all events, our correspondent, after having been directed by one of the chief clerks to get an authenticated transcript, found it impossible to obtain one, the reason alleged at the Paymaster's Office for refusing the request being that "to authenticate transcripts would require an entirely fresh staff in the office." The matter appears to call for some explanation. If the provision as to authentication is needless, why was it inserted in the rules? And is it for the officials at the Chancery Pay Office to decide upon what peremptory rules shall, and what shall not, be obeyed?

THE JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIS Bill, which was read a second time in the House of Lords on Tuesday night, is substantially the same as the Bill of last year, and will, we presume, at no distant period become law in a practically unaltered shape. It is, therefore, with great regret, not unmixed with disappointment, that we find the defects which were pointed out in last year's measure reproduced without alteration, whilst certain alterations are introduced which seem to us to be but additional defects.

The constitution of the Imperial Court of Appeal remains unaltered. While we fully admit, as indeed we did last year, the great superiority of the proposed court over that which would have been created had the Act of 1873 been passed in the form in which that Bill left the House of Commons, we cannot but lament that an opportunity should be lost, which may never recur, of establishing a thoroughly satisfactory court of ultimate appeal, which shall command the respect, and represent the legal intellect, of the entire Empire. Nor do we hesitate to state that with all its defects, theoretical and practical (and we, at any rate, have never made light of either), the House of Lords as it is would be a far more satisfactory court, and immeasurably more welcome to the Empire at large, than the somewhat anomalous body proposed by the Lord Chancellor. That (with one conspicuous exception) the most objectionable features in the composition of the proposed court are rather due to Lord Cairns' deference to the views of his immediate predecessor than to his own convictions, and are in direct opposition to his unofficial utterances on the subject, is, in our opinion, matter for additional regret; first, because there is all

the less hope of any effectual remedy for the evil; and, secondly, because the deference thus shown by the stronger and more statesmanlike Chancellor to the weaker and more technical gives rise to the most uncomfortable presages regarding the future of our law reform.

The justice of these remarks will at once appear from a short consideration of the provisions in question. By the 15th clause the Court of Appeal is divided into two or more "divisions," and an appeal to the "first division" is in certain specified cases given from the judgments of any other division. By the effect of the 16th clause the jurisdiction of the divisions other than the first is confined to appeals from courts in England, so that these divisions are practically substituted for the Courts of Appeal in Chancery and Exchequer Chamber, while the First Division practically fills the places of the House of Lords and Judicial Committee. They are thus completely distinct courts, performing totally different duties, one set of which is of a much higher and more dignified nature than the other. The essential difference between the functions of a court of first appeal and those of a court of final appeal has been pointed out more than once in these columns, and is explained at considerable length in a paper which we published a few weeks ago,* to which we beg to refer our readers. For what end, then, does Lord Cairns propose to describe these essentially distinct tribunals by the same name, and to treat them as "divisions" of the same court? We can imagine but two objects to be gained by this, and neither of them is of a nature to commend itself to us. First, it may flatter Lord Selborne's susceptibilities to find that, although his idea of abolishing double appeals has been completely overruled, the machinery he provided has not been formally set aside, but ingeniously altered so as to enable it to perform the functions which he expressly intended utterly to supersede. Secondly, it facilitates the carrying out of the Lord Chancellor's idea of "rotatory judges," one of the most extraordinary and, with all deference to his lordship, most unconstitutional propositions of which we have heard in recent times. The proposed composition of the First Division is as follows:—

"(2.) The first Divisional Court of the Imperial Court of Appeal shall consist of the Lord Chancellor, the two other *ex-officio* judges hereinafter mentioned, any number not exceeding three of the additional judges of the Imperial Court of Appeal, and three of the ordinary judges of the Imperial Court of Appeal, or of any five or more of them, such additional and ordinary judges of the Imperial Court of Appeal to be nominated to sit in the said Divisional Court by her Majesty as hereinafter mentioned.

"(3.) The two *ex-officio* judges, other than the Lord Chancellor, shall, for the first two years after the commencement of the principal Act, be the Lord Chief Justice of England and the Master of the Rolls in England, and for the next two years the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in England and the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in England; and so on in rotation, the first named two judges alternating at every period of two years with the two last named.

"(4.) Her Majesty may by warrant under her royal sign-manual, at any time after the passing of this Act, and from time to time, nominate to sit in the first Divisional Court such of the additional and ordinary judges of the Imperial Court of Appeal as to her Majesty may seem fit, so that the number of the additional judges so nominated do not at any one time exceed three, and the number of the ordinary judges so nominated do not at any one time exceed three. The nomination shall have effect for three years only from the date thereof, without prejudice, however, to the re-nomination of a retiring judge."

Here we have a direct proposal to re-introduce the system of judges holding office at the pleasure of the Crown (for a tenure from three years to three years is little better than one at will), the abolition of which was one of the most important results, and not the least difficult of accomplishment, of the Revolution of 1688. True,

* *Ibid.*, p. 119.

no possible modern Government is likely to make so arbitrary a use of this prerogative as was done under the Stuart Kings—i.e., this power is not so dangerous now as then; true, also, the temporary elevation of the nominated judge brings with it no added salary or emolument—i.e., the temptations to subserviency are not so great; but who can doubt that the failure to secure his re-appointment would be felt, not only by the judge himself, but by the community, as a slur upon the character, judicial or personal, of any judge so circumstanced, which no Minister would like to inflict and no judge could bear to contemplate? And this consideration would operate to destroy the whole value, in this respect, of the provision, without depriving it of its sting. For on the one hand, no honourable and high-minded Minister would lightly inflict such a disgrace, and therefore, under ordinary circumstances, the rule would be a dead letter; the retiring judge would be re-appointed as of course, in the absence of some such glaring incapacity or misconduct as would, in the absence of any provision on the subject, justify his removal by address of both Houses. On the other hand, in the hands of a corrupt or unscrupulous Minister—and such things have been—this power might be wielded with the most fatal effect; and the traditional respect and deference most deservedly shown to the judges as a body, would operate to shield from public criticism the acts of subserviency exacted as the price of re-appointment, and thus to deprive a weak, ambitious, or vacillating judge of one great source of support against the pressure from above. The modern history of the English bench, bright as it is in comparison with that of any other similar body in ancient or modern times, is not without instances to show that the influence of the Crown is even now real, and in some respects almost dangerous; and not the less so that it must necessarily be exerted indirectly and with more or less of concealment.

But this is by no means our only objection to the proposal in question. It may be admitted that the principle of filling the Court of Appeal with *ex-officio* judges, who are also judges of first instance, has been so far established by the Act of 1873 that it may now be regarded as a *fait accompli*, and it may even be conceded that, this being so, it would be impossible entirely to exclude the *ex-officio* element from the first division, as this would be in effect to assign to the *ex-officio* judges, who are all superior in dignity and emolument to the ordinary judges, a lower position in point of judicial competence. But the Bill proposes to introduce the *ex-officio* element in a manner the effect of which will be to make the same judge alternately superior and inferior, without reference either to personal eminence or official position, upon an arbitrary system of biennial rotation. Granting the necessity of admitting *ex-officio* judges, there still remained two other courses open to the framers of the Bill, either of which would have been, in our opinion, superior to the present proposal—one to attach the holders of one or more of these offices (say the Lord Chief Justice of England for the time being) permanently to the first division of the court; the other to require that not less than of the judges to be assigned to that division should be taken from the *ex-officio* judges of the court, leaving the particular individuals to be selected in the same manner and by the same authority as the other judges of that division. The Bill, as it stands, proposes to perpetuate to the extent indicated one of the gravest defects in the composition of the Court of Exchequer Chamber.

But, in truth, no scheme which can be devised will be satisfactory which does not completely separate the ultimate Imperial Court of Appeal from the intermediate court or courts of appeal for England, and place the former upon a representative basis, while making, or leaving, the latter a purely English court. As the Bill is drawn, it would be perfectly possible that the second and third divisions, which are to deal exclusively with

English appeals, should not contain a single English judge (except the *ex-officio* judges who were for the time being excluded from the first division), while the last-named division, which is to be the court of last resort for the whole Empire, might in its composition be an exclusively English court.

The question, how a satisfactory Imperial Court of Appeal should be constituted, has been already so fully discussed in this journal * that we do not think it desirable to repeat the argument at length.

The consideration of the other points arising upon the Bill must be reserved for another opportunity.

THE DISQUALIFICATION OF FELONS.

The question brought before the House of Commons with regard to the election of John Mitchell for the county of Tipperary, is no doubt one involving some complication in a legal point of view. We cannot, however, come to the conclusion that there is really much doubt about the matter, or that any substantial advantage would have accrued from further investigation or delay. With regard to future convictions, the question is settled by the express provisions of the Felony Act of 1870, which renders pardon or the endurance of the sentence the only means of restoring the *status* of the felon in respect of eligibility for public offices or Parliament. As to convictions or adjudications of felony previous to that Act, and their effect on the *status* of the convict in relation to his eligibility for election to Parliament, there does not apparently exist any distinct decision. The law must, therefore, be deduced by means of the application of general principles concerning the *status* of felons, and analogies derived from the law concerning such *status* in respect of similar matters. The House of Commons had, in truth, in Mitchell's case to construct a law on the subject in the same way as the judges are constantly constructing law with regard to new cases. There is not quite the same necessity for circumspection as to collateral legal consequences in the case of the House of Commons as there would have been in the case of a decision of a court of law. The only question with regard to which the decision of the House can be a precedent is that of the validity of a similar election in future, a question which is not very likely to recur, by reason of the provisions of the recent statute to which we have referred; whereas the courts of common law have to deal with questions relating to the *status* of felons generally, and the analogy of one decision affects all cases involving similar questions. Inasmuch as we think that there will be little real harm, and, on the contrary, probably considerable advantage in the decision that a person who, having been convicted of a felony, has defied the laws of his country by refusing to submit to his sentence, is thereby rendered incapable in future of sitting in Parliament, and as we do not think that, strictly speaking, there was any previous law on the point in dispute, it follows that the action of the majority is not, in our opinion, the subject of any substantial blame. It has been said that the result of this action is a possible conflict between the House and the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland. We cannot apprehend any such conflict as being practically likely. We cannot help thinking that any court would be governed by the principle that the House itself is the final authority in relation to the question whether a representative has been validly returned, except so far as it may have delegated its authority. If we are right in this, it follows that after the House has declared a particular return a nullity the Common Pleas would not go into any question as to the validity of the grounds on which it acted. The decision of the court would be in the nature of a judgment *in rem*.

* 18 S. J. p. 427.

With respect to the matter before the House, various confusions arise which have to be cleared away before it can be put in a fair way of solution. In the first place the question whether John Mitchell could be prosecuted for any offence in the nature of prison breach is immaterial. That being a substantive felony or misdemeanour of which he is not convicted, is wholly out of the question. Secondly, the question whether at common law a felon escaping before the completion of his sentence, and while such sentence admittedly remains in force, can be re-captured, or whether such escape puts an end to the original sentence, leaving him only liable for the substantive offence of prison breach, is not strictly speaking at issue here; because in this case it is contended that the time had expired during which the sentence was in force. Some authorities on this point are referred to in 2 Hawkins, P. C. 193, in which a distinction seems to be made between a negligent and a voluntary escape. It would rather seem from what is there said that the balance of authority is in favour of the liability to be re-taken, and *Madan's case* (1 Leach, C. C. 223) seems to be pretty nearly conclusive to show that in the case of transportation the power to re-arrest and remit for the remainder of the term of transportation does exist. We believe this question, however, at the present day to be practically immaterial for general purposes by reason of the various statutes applying to escapes from penal servitude, and it will be afterwards seen that, in the view we take, it is immaterial to the present controversy.

Another question which has been raised with relation to the matter in hand is whether, after the effluxion of the time when the sentence, if duly carried out, would be complete, the sentence must be considered exhausted. This is, in substance, the same question as whether a sentence—say of penal servitude for seven years—is a sentence that the prisoner shall suffer penal servitude for seven years at such time as the authorities can procure his subjection to such penal servitude, or during the seven years dating from the sentence. This question is to be considered apart from any special statutory enactment. When the execution is respited on a case being reserved for the Court of Criminal Appeal, of course the sentence dates from the period of execution commencing; but, inasmuch as, at common law, execution follows a sentence of imprisonment immediately, it seems to us that the sentence must be considered as applying to the period next following—that is to say, a sentence of penal servitude for seven years must mean a sentence of penal servitude for the seven years following the date of the sentence. Is not the fact that sentences, unless expressly made cumulative, are concurrent, a strong argument to show that this is so? This question, however, like the former one, is practically immaterial for general purposes by reason of the common law, and the various enactments making it a substantive offence to be at large while a term of penal servitude or imprisonment is unexpired, which offence remains after the expiration of the term. It is also, in our point of view, immaterial to the present question.

Assuming, then, that the sentence on John Mitchell was exhausted, was he disqualified from being returned for Tipperary? If the answer is yes, it is obvious that all the former questions we have adverted to are immaterial. Considerations derived from the case of a felon whose sentence is unexpired, such as *O'Donovan Rossa*, are not absolutely conclusive. It is obvious that such a felon is not *sub jure*, not a free agent, and consequently that he cannot, in fact, act as the representative of a constituency. It would be absurd that such a man should be eligible. In the case of a felon whose sentence has expired we must seek for an incapacity in some general principle affecting the *status* of all felons. It is put by divers learned authorities, including Lord Coke and Whitelocke, that felons are incapacitated by reason of the description given in the writ of the persons to be returned. This reason was alleged in *O'Donovan Rossa's case*, and was relied upon by the Solicitor-General in the

recent debate, but it is open to the observation that it is dangerously wide. Why are not misdemeanants unfit persons; or notorious profligates, or drunkards?

The proposition which we think a careful consideration of the authorities will satisfactorily establish is, that the adjudication of the court that a person is guilty of felony discredits and disqualifies him from the exercise of, at any rate, such civil functions as imply credit and public responsibility. Some confusion is, no doubt, created by the distinction between attainer and conviction and the identification of the former with sentence of death by Blackstone and other authorities. The distinction between conviction and attainer was originally clear. Lord Coke, in many passages, expressly lays it down that attainer is upon judgment given of felony (Co. Litt. 390b, 391a). Conviction *per se* involved no adjudication of felony by the court; it was merely the finding of the jury, or other means by which the court was informed of the prisoner's guilt. This is plain when we consider that originally the jury did not so much form a part of the tribunal as they were in the nature of witnesses presenting the guilt of the prisoner. In later times the conviction and the adjudication became confused together, because, the jury having become substantially the adjudicators, all that the court has to do is to sentence. Hence the attainer comes to be looked upon as the sentence of death merely, and it seems to have been concluded by some that without sentence of death there could be no adjudication for any purpose of the *status* of felony. This we doubt. It appears to us that the attainer originally involved two things, of which one is essential, the other more in the nature of an accident, viz., adjudication by the court that the man is a felon, and, as a consequence, a sentence of death. Some of the books seem to us rather to put the cart before the horse in saying that the man is a felon because he is sentenced to death, not that he is sentenced to death because he is a felon. Coke tells us that it was not till the time of Henry I. that all felonies were made punishable by hanging, and Blackstone, though he lays it down that attainer is the sentence of death, expressly refuses to make the death sentence an essential part of the definition of felony, which he makes to depend upon the penalty of forfeiture. Inasmuch as in former times all felonies were punishable by death it is very easy to see how, in the eye of the law, the attainer became a convertible term with the death sentence. A person when attainted of felony in this sense of the term became dead in law. He could not sue (Co. Litt. 158). He could not be an approver (2 Hawkins, P. C. 205.) His blood was corrupted. It is not necessary for our present purpose to contend that there can be an attainer in this narrowed sense of the term when, the felony not being capital, there is no death sentence. The authorities are not very explicit on the subject; but the case of *Rex v. Bridger* (1 M. & W. 145) seems directly to show that certain incapacities, such as corruption of blood, followed on attainer only, i.e., on an adjudication of felony followed by sentence of death. But this seems to come very far short of showing that a man has in no respect the *status* of a felon unless he is sentenced to death and that the adjudication of felony without sentence of death does not involve certain incapacities. The statute 9 Geo. 4, c. 32, s. 3, which we shall afterwards refer to more fully, seems to imply that certain civil disabilities attached to the *status* of a person adjudged to be a felon when there could be no attainer. We think that a reference to the case of *Rex v. Burridge* (3 P. Wms. 455, 457), and the authorities there cited, will show very clearly that a judgment of felony, apart from attainer, involved a *status* of discredit. The case turns on the old practice of allowance of clergy, which practice appears to have been to a great extent the origin of the system of minor punishments, such as transportation for less heinous felonies. A case that arose on Lord Warwick's trial in 1699 is there referred to, where it was solemnly resolved by the judges that one con-

victed of manslaughter and allowed his clergy, but not burnt in the hand nor pardoned as to the burning, was not restored to his credit, and consequently was inadmissible as a witness. It was ultimately decided in *Ree v. Burridge* that, inasmuch as transportation was substituted by statute for the actual burning in the hand, and not for the mere sentence of burning in the hand, until the sentence had been suffered the *status* of a felon remained, and therefore that the prisoner who had aided the convict to escape was liable for aiding a felon to escape. Hale's Pleas of the Crown (tit. Clergy, 240) is referred to in the case as establishing that the credit of a felon claiming benefit of clergy can only be restored upon the burning in the hand. In Heywood's County Elections, 335, it is also stated that a felon sentenced to a less punishment than death cannot vote. The learning concerning benefit of clergy is very obscure, and baffles anything but a very laborious inquiry; but it would seem clear, from the authorities referred to in *Ree v. Burridge*, that the minor penalties, such as transportation, substituted for the benefit of clergy, ultimately came to involve, not a mere discharge of the prisoner convicted on condition, but a judgment of the court of felony against him. So also an adjudication of felony was involved in the case of a great many of the statutes relating to transportation, the scheme of which was to sentence the prisoner to death and then reprove him on condition of transportation, or to pardon him subject to the same condition. In such cases the sentence of death remained suspended, and might be inflicted if the condition was broken. It was held in *Bullock v. Dodds* (2 B. & Ald. 258), where the authorities are very fully reviewed, that the *status* of felony remained unless the sentence of transportation was actually endured to the end.

The conclusion to which we come, then, on the authorities is, that even if mere conviction of felony did not involve disability, an adjudication of felony by the court, such as there clearly is in the case of treason-felony, so far partakes of the nature of an attainer proper as to involve a *status* of discredit. Without being actually in durance, a person when adjudged a felon, was clearly, apart from statute, not a competent witness or jurymen. If so, is it not clear by analogy that he is disqualified for election to Parliament?

The question then arises, How can this *status* of disqualification be removed? There is not a trace in any of the books of any mode of accomplishing this result but pardon or endurance of the sentence. It is, perhaps, doubtful whether in truth the effect of the latter is not as being the equivalent of the former. In cases where the transportation was a condition of the pardon, this clearly was so. The reasoning in *Ree v. Burridge*, by which transportation was held to be equivalent to actual burning in the hand, not to mere judgment to be burnt in the hand, is strong to show that mere expiration of the term of transportation could not remove the disability. The statute of 9 Geo. 4, c. 32, s. 3, seems to us pretty nearly conclusive of the whole question. That enacts, for the resolution of doubts concerning the civil rights of those who had been sentenced for felony to less punishments than death, that "when any offender hath been or shall be convicted of any felony not punishable with death, and hath endured or shall endure the punishment to which such offender hath been or shall be adjudged for the same, the punishment so endured hath or shall have the like effects and consequences as a pardon under the Great Seal." If pardon, or the actual endurance of the penalty as equivalent thereto, is the only means of removing the *status* of felony, it is clear that John Mitchel is now a felon. If now a felon, can he be capable of representing a constituency in Parliament? Surely the question answers itself.

Mr. Justice Deaman has been placed on the rota of election judges in the place of Sir George Honyman.

Pending Legislation.

JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT.

Confining ourselves to a summary of the more important changes made in this Bill since it was first introduced last year, we may notice that by clause 7 it is proposed that the jurisdiction of the Lords Justices in respect of lunatics shall be exercised by such judge or judges of the High Court or Court of Appeal as may be intrusted by sign manual with their care. Each of the persons who may, at the commencement of the Judicature Act, 1873, be Lords Justices, as long as he continues a judge of the Court of Appeal and is intrusted with the care of lunatics, is to retain the jurisdiction now vested in him. By clause 8 every judge of the Probate division of the High Court, appointed after the passing of the Act, is, when the state of business in his division will allow, to share the duty of holding sittings for trials by jury in Middlesex and London and sittings under commissions of assize, &c. Clause 9 provides that the jurisdiction of the London Court of Bankruptcy shall not be transferred to the High Court, but shall continue in all respects as if such transfer had not been made by the Act of 1873, except that the office of Chief Judge shall be filled by such one of the judges of the Exchequer division of the High Court as may be assigned, and that the appeal from the London court shall be to the Court of Appeal. Persons entitled to bring error or appeal to the Lords from any judgment made before the commencement of the Act, are enabled (clause 11) to bring it instead to the Court of Appeal, and parties to any writ of error or appeal to the Lords which may be pending at the commencement of the Act may, within the first twenty-one days of the next session of Parliament, present to the Lords a petition praying that their writ of error or appeal may be transferred for hearing to the Court of Appeal, and the Lords may order such transfer to be made. Provision is made by clause 12 for the registrar in ecclesiastical and admiralty causes becoming an officer attached to the Supreme Court. Clause 14 proposes to amend section 35 of the Judicature Act, 1873, which provides that, subject to rules of court and to the provisions of the Judicature Act and to the power of transfer, the plaintiff may choose in what division he will sue, by re-enacting the section, with the addition of a few words removing an ambiguity with reference to assigning causes to the Probate division.

As to the constitution of the divisional courts of appeal (clause 15), the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and the Chief Baron are to alternate every two years with the Chief Justice of England and the Master of the Rolls as *ex officio* members of the first division. The change introduced during the progress of the Bill last year allowing a re-hearing in case a material part of the judgment appealed from is reversed on a question of law by any divisional court other than the first, is retained, and it is provided that the question whether a decision does or does not reverse, on a question of law, a material part of the judgment shall be determined by the first divisional court.

With respect to the district registrars, it is proposed (clause 17) to take power to appoint two persons as joint district registrars, and also to qualify for appointment to that post the registrar of any inferior court of record (other than a county court). Every district registrar is to be deemed an officer of the Supreme Court. Provision is made (clause 18) for the appointment of an attendant officer to any additional judge of the Court of Appeal. We printed in full last week the provisions (clauses 19-21) relating to practitioners before the Court of Appeal. Power is given (clause 22) by order in council to extend the enactments with reference to appeals from county courts to any other inferior court of record; also (clause 28) by order in council to discontinue wholly or partially any existing circuit and to form any new circuit, to appoint the

places at which assizes are to be held in any circuit, to alter the day appointed for holding the assizes at any place on the circuit, and to regulate the venue in all cases, civil and criminal. Power is given (clause 29) by rules of court to modify any provisions in respect of the practice or procedure of any courts the jurisdiction of which is transferred by the Act to the High Court or the Court of Appeal; also to fix the fees to be taken in those courts.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

STATUTE OF FRAUDS—PART PERFORMANCE.

Coles v. Pilkington, V.C.M., 23 W. R. 41.

This is rather a startling case. Assuming the material part of the plaintiff's case to have been strictly proved, it was as follows:—Sarah Coles owned a leasehold house, which she allowed her sister, Ann Heath, to occupy rent free, that is to say, paying only the ground rent and rates and taxes. The plaintiff resided with Ann Heath from 1859 to 1861, when Ann Heath died. The plaintiff then looked about for some means of making her living, and with that view began to negotiate for a share in a millinery business. Sarah Coles then called upon her, apparently while she was still in possession of the house, and advised her not to go into business, and promised that she should have the house for her life on the terms on which it had been held by Ann Heath. The plaintiff thereupon gave up the idea of going into business, and continued in the house, maintaining herself by letting lodgings. Sarah Coles died in 1871; and a couple of years afterwards, the defendant, to whom she had left all her property, brought an action of ejectment to recover possession of the house. To restrain this action the present bill was filed, praying for a declaration that the plaintiff was entitled to the house for her life, on the terms aforesaid. The defendant set up the Statute of Frauds. The Vice-Chancellor held that possession was part performance sufficient to take the contract out of the statute, and, apparently, that if there had been no possession the contract could have been enforced. The latter position is wholly untenable, and we shall direct our attention solely to the question of part performance.

Now the first, and indeed only, real question in this case is, What was the state of things between the plaintiff and Sarah Coles immediately after the former had given up the idea of going into business? Suppose Sarah Coles had repented of her generosity, and asked the plaintiff to give up possession, would a court of equity have decreed specific performance of the promise? The principle on which a court of equity dispenses with the requirements of the statute in these cases is, that not doing so would result in fraud. Is it then fraud in the view of a court of equity to withdraw from a rash promise of pure bounty, even if the promisee has acted on the faith of the promise being kept? It seems sufficient to ask the question without giving any answer to it.

Again, to put the matter in a slightly different light, Lord Redesdale, in *Bond v. Hopkins* (1 S. & L. 433), says that the court has been in the habit of relieving against the statute, "where the party seeking relief has been put into a situation which makes it against conscience in the other party to insist on the want of writing so signed, as a bar to his relief." This is only another way of stating the principle mentioned above as that on which the court proceeds; but it raises the question, How, if the circumstances of the transaction were such as to make it manifest that, if a writing had been asked for, it would have been refused? In the present case, where there was no consideration whatever passing to Mrs. Coles, it is tolerably clear that if the plaintiff had asked for a lease in writing for her life, and declined to give up the idea of taking a business without a formal lease,

the fountain of Mrs. Coles' bounty would have been frozen at its source. It is plain that, in the contemplation of both parties, the promise was one of a merely honorary character, that the plaintiff was content to rely on Mrs. Coles' honour that she would not go back from her word, and that the whole transaction was on an entirely different footing from any reported case where the court has enforced contracts taking the business form of a *quid pro quo*.

It only remains to add that mere lapse of time could not affect the footing on which Mrs. Coles and the plaintiff stood with respect to each other—viz., that of patroness and *protégée*—and that the defendant in the suit, in succeeding to the house, had succeeded to all Mrs. Coles' interest and powers.

Reviews.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, AND THE DEBTORS ACT, 1869, INCLUDING THE RULES, ORDERS, AND FORMS. Illustrated by Notes of all the Important Decisions thereon, since the Year 1869, &c. By FRANK PITT-TAYLOR, Barrister-at-Law. Maxwell & Son.

Mr. Pitt-Taylor gives in a handy volume the Acts of 1869, rules and forms, scales of costs and fees, the Absconding Debtors Act, 1870, and the Bankruptcy Disqualification Act, 1871. To the Bankruptcy and Debtors Acts and rules he has appended notes of decisions. He does not profess to furnish information as to the law and practice in bankruptcy before 1870, or to discuss any points of difficulty on the construction of the Acts. His aim appears to be to present the effect of the decisions on the recent statutes as shortly as possible, and as we learn from the preface, to furnish the practitioner with "a book of ready reference." Judging the work by this standard, our first observation must be that it would have been more convenient if the notes had been placed at the foot of each page, instead of at the end of each section. At p. 16 the reader in search of note (p) has to hunt over about five pages of small type, and the letters of reference do not readily catch the eye. At p. 97, again, note (d) is five pages off. It is desirable, wherever possible, to have the enactment and the illustrative cases on the same page. On the other hand, we must not omit to notice the convenient system adopted of references to the rules and forms in the margin of the Acts, and to the Acts in the margin of the rules. These references, so far as we have tested them, appear to be careful and complete.

The statements in the notes of the effect of cases seem to be generally fairly accurate and are always terse. The title-page affirms that the work contains notes of all the important decisions since the year 1869. We do not know by what standard Mr. Pitt-Taylor would judge of the importance of a case. The work appears to contain the leading cases before the Chief Judge and Court of Appeal on points of principle; but cases on points of practice are often of great importance to the readers for whom this work is intended; and, as to these, we think a little more industry might have been shown. Thus, to take only one instance: on page 101 we find a note—"As to when a registrar has power to direct a fresh first meeting to be called, see *Ex parte Cobb, re Sedley*;" but no reference is given to the group of cases—e.g., *Ex parte Cadot and Johnston* (18 S. J. 47); *Ex parte Cohen, re Cohen* (Ib. 283); *Re MacArthur* (Ib. 342); *Ex parte Bedell* (19 S. J. 107), and others, in which the doctrine of that case has been explained, and new first meetings have been allowed.

It is stated that the appointment of an assistant solicitor to the Treasury, in the place of Mr. Augustus Keppel Stephenson, is to be postponed for the present.

Notes.

THE QUESTION has recently been raised in *Re Haney's Trusts*, whether the Court of Chancery has power to order a petition under the Trustee Relief Act to be served upon a person out of the jurisdiction. Vice-Chancellor Bacon was of opinion that this could be done; but, as it appeared that the Master of the Rolls had, in *Re Macburn's Settled Estates* (22 W. R. 752), expressed an opinion that, in the case of a statutory jurisdiction (he was then dealing with the Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act), the court could not direct service out of the jurisdiction unless power to do so was given to it by statute, the Vice-Chancellor gave leave to mention the case to the Court of Appeal. This was done on Monday, and the Lords Justices adopted the view of the Vice-Chancellor.

ON THE SAME DAY, in *Richards v. Goddard*, a question arose as to the payment of the expenses of a witness who was required to be produced for cross-examination. By the 19th rule of the orders of the 5th of February, 1861, the right is given to a party who desires to cross-examine a deponent or witness of his opponent to require his opponent to produce the deponent or witness for cross-examination, and then the order provides that "the party producing such deponent or witness shall be entitled to demand the expenses thereof, in the first instance, from the party requiring such production; but such expenses shall ultimately be borne as the court shall direct." Vice-Chancellor Hall held that the question of taxation and payment of the expenses of production was a matter which should stand over until the hearing of the cause. The Lords Justices, however, decided, in accordance with what seems to be the natural interpretation of the words of the rule, that the party producing the witness is entitled to an order for the immediate taxation and payment of the expenses, though, of course, the court may ultimately decide at the hearing that he must bear these expenses himself.

THE DEBTORS ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 62), by section 15 enacts that "where a debtor makes any arrangement or composition with his creditors under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, he shall remain liable for the unpaid balance of any debt which he incurred or increased, or whereof, before the date of the arrangement or composition, he obtained forbearance, by any fraud, provided the defrauded creditor has not assented to the arrangement or composition otherwise than by proving his debt and accepting dividends." In *Ex parte Halford*, heard by the Chief Judge on Monday, the question was raised whether a creditor who, after receiving a composition from his debtor, brings an action for the balance of his debt on the ground that it was contracted by the debtor fraudulently, is bound to shew to the Court of Bankruptcy a *prima facie* case of fraud before he can be allowed to proceed with his action. The Chief Judge held that the Court of Bankruptcy has no jurisdiction to interfere with such an action, and that the creditor is only bound to prove the fraud to a jury in the action.

IN A CASE OF *Ex parte Dowe*, heard on the same day, a question arose upon section 87 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. A creditor levied execution upon a trader for a debt above £50, and on the 17th of September the sheriff sold, but the proceeds of the sale were not paid to the creditor until the 13th of October. On the 23rd of September the same creditor levied another execution for another debt above £50. Under this execution the goods were sold on the 29th of September, and the money was paid to the creditor on the 15th of October. On the 21st of October a bankruptcy petition was presented against the debtor by another creditor, the act of bankruptcy alleged being the seizure and sale under the first execution, and on the 5th of November an adjudication was made. It was decided in the county court that the second payment was good, under the authority of *Ex parte Villars* (22 W. R. 603 L. R. 9 Ch. 432), it having been made by the sheriff after the expiration of fourteen days from the sale, and no notice

of any bankruptcy petition having been given to him within that time. The Chief Judge, however, held that the execution creditor must refund the proceeds of the second execution, on the ground that when the second seizure was made he had notice of the act of bankruptcy committed by the seizure and sale under the first execution. It was not necessary to prove that he had actual notice of the fact that the sale had taken place under the first execution, inasmuch as he must be taken to have known what took place under his own execution. In *Pearson v. Graham* (6 A. & E. 899) it was held that the onus lies on the execution creditor to prove that he had no notice of a prior act of bankruptcy, and this view was adopted by Lord Justice Mellish in *Ex parte Schullis* (22 W. R. 462, L. R. 9 Ch. 409).

IT MAY NOT, perhaps, be generally known, says a correspondent, that, in consenting to his transfer to the Common Pleas, Mr. Justice Archibald has, without asking for compensation, surrendered his chance of a valuable reversion. By 6 Geo. 4, c. 84, s. 7, a certain reward of forty pounds per annum, at the rate of ten pounds in every term, which, so far back as 1762, "had long since been assigned to the second judge of the Court of King's Bench in respect of his labour and trouble in giving the charge to the grand jury, and pronouncing judgment in the said court against malefactors," was expressly secured to the senior puisne judge of the court. "The said termly allowance of ten pounds, or reward of forty pounds per annum," declares the statute, "shall continue to be paid to the said second judge of the said Court of King's Bench after the passing of this Act, in addition to all other sums of money which such second judge shall be entitled to receive under or by virtue of this Act, or any other Act or Acts."

AT THE SITTING of the county court at Bradford, on Tuesday, a barrister, who appeared in a case which was some distance down the list, called the attention of the judge to the 57th rule of 1870, the effect of which was that cases should be taken as they stood on the list, but that motions moved by members of the bar should have precedence over those supported by attorneys. He said that of course in any case in which there was any special emergency, the members of the bar would be quite willing to meet gentlemen of the other branch of the profession; but he asked that where there were not such special circumstances, the cases in which counsel appeared should have the precedence granted to them by the rule. Mr. Daniel, Q.C., the judge, said that the question as to the best mode of arranging the business of the court had been very carefully considered by him, and he had thought it best that bankruptcy business and common law business should not be taken on the same days. An arrangement had, therefore, been made at the beginning of the present term, that bankruptcy motions should be taken on the first and third Tuesdays in each month; that a list of the cases should be made, and that they should be taken in the order in which they stood on the list. That being the rule laid down, he thought that he was bound to abide by it. At any rate, the 57th rule referred to only related to cases in which the motion was made by counsel, and did not extend to motions made by attorneys which were opposed by counsel. He was sure that the good feeling that existed between the two branches of the profession would prevent any conflict from arising between them.

A REMARK made by Lord Justice Mellish in the case of *Ex parte Warren*, noticed in another column, with regard to section 72 of the Bankruptcy Act is deserving of attention. That section provides that "if in any proceeding in bankruptcy there arises any question of fact which the parties desire to be tried before a jury, instead of by the court itself, or which the court thinks ought to be tried by a jury, the court may direct such trial to be had." One of the parties in *Ex parte Warren* desired to have the amount of the damages assessed by a jury, while the other wished to have it settled by the registrar. Lord Justice Mellish said that a jury could only be had under section 72 either upon the consent of both parties, or if the court con-

considered the case a proper one to be tried in that way. This dictum may be usefully compared with the doubt expressed by the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Brown* (23 W. R. 230).

General Correspondence.

"DEVILLING" AT THE BAR.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I wish to direct the attention of the profession to that has recently befallen a client of mine owing to this pernicious system. I was concerned as solicitor for a petitioner in a divorce suit. On the case coming before the court the respondent and co-respondent were unrepresented. I had briefed a young barrister, who is occupied with work other than that of advocacy or chamber practice. He had had his brief for months. To my horror, when the case came on, a gentleman was holding my brief of whom I knew nothing, far younger than the man I had briefed, nervous and—well I will give you what happened. Of the facts of the case he knew little or nothing; in addressing the jury on the question of damages he simply said, "I leave it entirely in your hands." He asked the learned judge for a decree *nisi* before the finding of the jury, and said nothing as to costs, being of opinion "that they followed the event." My client (a poor man), in a clear case, therefore, only got a decree *nisi* without costs and without damages, while the instructions in the brief warranted an urgent appeal for both. Never was greater injustice done to any client. Some means must be devised to arrest a continuance of this state of things.

A SOLICITOR.

CERTIFICATE DUTY—UNCERTIFICATED SOLICITORS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I am glad your correspondent "Vigilans" has raised the question of the abolition of the certificate duty. All arguments in favour of the abolition have no doubt been previously stated, but will you permit me to suggest that if the duty cannot be taken off altogether an attempt should be made by the Law Society to have it reduced? Numbers of solicitors, acting as managing clerks, do not take out certificates who I am satisfied would do so if a smaller sum were fixed.

I should like to hear the opinion of some of your readers as to the effect of the proposed clauses set out *ante* p. 297 on those of my class, who, although on the present roll of attorneys, do not take out a certificate to practise.

AN UNCERTIFICATED ATTORNEY.

LORD ST. LEONARDS AND THE FLEET PRISONERS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—If your correspondent "J. E. W." refers to the *Times* of the 29th ult. he will find there in the memoir of Lord St. Leonards the following:—"In the midst of his most pressing occupations he would find time to pay secret visits to the old Fleet Prison, converse with its wretched inmates, and give them, without fee, the benefit of his advice and counsel, which he often followed up by paying out of his own pocket the costs for which they were incarcerated, and so procuring their discharge."

EDWARD PRESTON.

AUTHENTICATING TRANSCRIPTS AT THE CHANCERY AUDIT OFFICE.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—By rule 88 of the Chancery Funds Consolidated Rules, 1874, the Chancery Paymaster is to issue a transcript, "and, if so required by the person to whom it is issued, such transcript shall be authenticated at the Chancery Audit Office."

One day last month one of the chief clerks required me to get an authenticated transcript under this rule, and accordingly, on the 22nd, my clerk went to the Chancery Audit Office for the purpose. The messenger at the door

at first refused to allow him to go in, saying that it was a private office. Ultimately he succeeded in seeing one of the clerks, who told him the Audit Office did nothing except through the Pay Office.

He therefore went to the Paymaster-General's Office and applied to the clerk there to get the transcript authenticated, but this official declined to have anything to do with the matter. My clerk pressing him, however, he said he would apply to the chief of the office, which he accordingly did, but that gentleman sent word back that he would have nothing to do with it, and that "to authenticate transcripts would require an entirely fresh staff in the office."

Now I am certainly unable to suggest any possible use in authenticating a transcript, because I never heard of any fraud being attempted in consequence of the old system of issuing transcripts without other authentication than the form of the book and its general aspect. But I should be glad to know why rules are made if they are not to be carried out?

A LONDON SOLICITOR.

"TOWN COUNCILLORS AND BURGESSES' MANUAL."

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I observe in your journal (February 20), a review of my book "The Town Councillors and Burgesses' Manual." Your reviewer suggests that the book is not written in good English, and refers to the following passage on page 24 as an instance, "He is affected by bankruptcy, &c., in the same manner as the other members of the council, and on any happening the council, &c." It is obvious that by an error in printing the word "vacancy" has been omitted after the words "and on any." The information "as to how other members of the council are affected by bankruptcy, &c.," is found on page 43, and is referred to in the index (p. 267).

In a journal so extensively circulated and so much relied upon as the *Solicitors' Journal*, your reviewer's somewhat inaccurate remarks may injuriously affect the interest of the publishers; I have therefore ventured to draw your attention to them.

L. GACHES.

[We cannot admit that because the sentence on p. 24 might have been and ought to have been printed differently, our observation upon it (not upon the book) was incorrect. But on the other point we regret that we have inadvertently done Mr. Gaches an injustice. The information is to be found on the page he names. When we add, however, that the information as to the consequences of the bankruptcy, &c., of members of the council is contained under the extraordinary head of "Counting Votes," and that the title in the index "Bankruptcy of a Member of Council" refers only to p. 24, we think we shall have said enough to acquit ourselves of any great carelessness.—ED. S. J.]

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The usual weekly meeting of this society was held at the Law Institution on Tuesday evening last, Mr. Indermaur in the chair. Messrs. Benning and Upton were duly elected members of the society. The secretary read a list of the members of the society who had taken honours at the Final Examination held in Hilary Term. The question appointed for discussion was No. 554 Legal—"A contract was made out of the jurisdiction, but a breach of contract arose within the jurisdiction. Is the plaintiff entitled to take proceedings under the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, s. 18?" The question was well discussed, and ultimately decided in the affirmative by a narrow majority.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall, on Wednesday last, the subject for the evening's debate being:—"That section 7 of the Vendors and Purchasers Act, 1874, requires amendment." The motion was carried unanimously.

Obituary.

MR. THOMAS HORNCastle MARSHALL.

Mr. Thomas Horncastle Marshall, barrister-at-law, of the Mount, York, judge of county courts in Circuit No. 14, died at St. Leonards on the 18th ult. in his seventy-fifth year. The deceased was the third son of the Rev. Thomas Horncastle Marshall, formerly Vicar of Pontefract, and was born at Marston on the 1st of March, 1800. He was called to the bar in Michaelmas Term, 1821, and four years later he settled at Leeds (in which town his father was born), practising as a conveyancer, special pleader, and also at sessions and assizes. He married, in 1829, the younger daughter of Richard Temple, M.D., of Bedford-row, London. In 1832 he was appointed a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and in the same year Revising Barrister for North Northumberland. He 1835 he received the appointment of deputy-steward of the Honor of Pontefract, and in 1837 that of deputy-chairman of the Barneley Court of Requests. In April, 1847, he was appointed by Lord Cottenham judge of county courts for the Leeds district, which office he held until his death. Of the manner in which he discharged his judicial functions during this long period, those among whom he administered justice are the best able to judge, and we cannot do better than quote from a notice which has appeared in the *Leeds Mercury*:—"Few public positions are so calculated to try the patience and temper of any man as that of judge of a busy county court; but throughout his long career Mr. Marshall was most painstaking and conscientious in the administration of justice. Ever anxious to elicit the actual truth of all cases that came before him, he spared no trouble in inquiring into the whole facts, and in deciding fairly between the parties. His general success in these endeavours may be inferred from the fact that his decisions were very seldom appealed against." At the sitting of the court on the 19th ult. the leading practitioners gave expression to their esteem and regret in terms which we have reported elsewhere, and which constitute an honourable testimony to the admirable manner in which the business of this important court was discharged by the late judge. Mr. Marshall was a magistrate for the West Riding, and a bencher of Gray's-inn, and the author of a work on the jurisdiction and practice of the Honor of Pontefract Court. His experience as judge of that court was found very useful by the framers of the original County Court Act, and several clauses of that Act were drawn and suggested by him.

MR. JOSEPH FREDERICK JESSOPP.

Mr. Joseph Frederick Jessopp, solicitor, of Waltham Abbey and Edmonton, died at his residence at the former place on the 13th ult., at the age of forty-four, from inflammation of the lungs, after a very short illness. Mr. Jessopp was the son of Mr. Joseph Jessopp, solicitor, of Waltham Abbey, and was admitted in 1859. In the following year he succeeded his father in the offices of clerk to the Essex magistrates at Waltham Abbey, to the Middlesex magistrates at Edmonton, and to the Hertfordshire magistrates at Cheshunt. He was for many years in partnership with Mr. John William Frederick Siddall (who was Registrar of the County Court at Waltham Abbey), but since that gentleman's death in 1869 he had been associated with Mr. Herbert Gough. Mr. Jessopp also held the offices of vestry clerk of Waltham Abbey and clerk to the Waltham Abbey Local Board of Health.

Mr. Justice Quain is confined to his house by a severe cold, and was not present at the opening of the Berks Assizes. Mr. Powell, Q.C., and Mr. Matthews, Q.C., assisted in the despatch of the criminal business. Mr. Baron Amphlett alone attended at the opening of the assizes at Warwick, Lord Coleridge being detained by the illness of his father. His lordship is, however, expected to arrive on Saturday, and meanwhile Mr. Maule, Q.C., will preside in the Crown Court.

Appointments, Etc.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE, barrister, has been appointed a Crown Prosecutor for the county of Donegal, in succession to Mr. Robert J. Johnston, Q.C., resigned.

Mr. JOHN HENRY HORTIN, solicitor, of 161, Edgware-road, has been appointed Solicitor to the Paddington Vestry, in the place of the late Mr. Frederic James Fuller.

Mr. JOHN SHAW, solicitor, of Madras, has been appointed Registrar of the High Court of Judicature in that presidency.

Mr. ROBERT HILL PINHEY, barrister, has been appointed a Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay. Mr. Pinhey was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1869, and has been for several years a member of the Bombay Civil Service. He has recently held the post of Sessions Judge at Poonah.

Mr. ALFRED CHARLES TATHAM, solicitor, of 11, Staple-inn, and Highgate, has been appointed Solicitor to the Hornsey School Board.

Mr. BEAUCHAMP NEWTON JOHNSON, solicitor, of Dublin and Downpatrick, has been appointed Sessional Crown Solicitor for the county of Down, in succession to Mr. Joshua Michael Magee, resigned.

Mr. FRANCIS HAMPSON, solicitor, of Manchester, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cheshire (Richard Barton, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. John Tatlock, of Chester, will again be the acting Under-Sheriff.

Mr. SAMUEL LEECH, solicitor, of Derby, has been appointed by the Sheriff of Derbyshire (Charles Robert Colville, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year.

Mr. WILLIAM GRAY, solicitor, of York, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Yorkshire (William Frogatt Bethell, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year.

Mr. FRANCIS T. JOHNS, solicitor, of Blandford, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Dorset (Sir W. H. S. Marriott, Bart.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Johns has held this office on two previous occasions.

Mr. WILLIAM EVANS, solicitor (of the firm of Wragge, Evans, & Chesson), of Birmingham, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Staffordshire (Lieut.-Col. Bagnall) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year.

Mr. WILLIAM STOLLARD, solicitor, of South Molton-street, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Exchequer of Pleas.

Mr. J. R. Cover, solicitor, of 22, Great Winchester-street, E.C., has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer Oaths in Chancery.

Mr. JOHN WALTER HUDDLESTON, Q.C., M.P., who has been appointed to the puisne judgeship in the Court of Common Pleas, vacant by the resignation of Sir George Essex Honyman, Bart., is the son of the late Thomas Huddleston, Esq., R.N., by Alethes, daughter of the late Henry Hitchens, Esq., and was born at Dublin in 1817. He graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in Easter Term, 1839, when he joined the Oxford Circuit and Staffordshire and Worcestershire Sessions; he also had a large criminal practice at the Central Criminal Court and Middlesex Sessions, besides being extensively engaged in poor-law cases. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1857, and has enjoyed for many years the undisputed lead of his circuit. In 1866 he succeeded the late Mr. Phinn, Q.C., in the post of Counsel to the Admiralty and Judge-Advocate of the Fleet. Mr. Huddleston has always supported the Conservative party, and unsuccessfully contested Worcester in 1852 and 1857, and Kidderminster in 1859. In 1865 he was returned for the city of Canterbury, but failed to retain his seat at the general election of 1868. In 1870 he unsuccessfully contested Norwich, but was returned for that city at the general election of last year. While M.P.

for Canterbury he introduced and carried the Hop (Prevention of Frauds) Act, 1836 (29 & 30 Vict. c. 37). On the promotion of Sir Richard Baggallay to the Attorney-Generalship, the post of Solicitor-General was offered to Mr. Huddleston, but declined by him. Mr. Huddleston is a bencher of Gray's-inn (of which society he has twice been treasurer), and a member of the Council of Legal Education.

The Judgeship of County Courts for Circuit No. 14 has become vacant by the death of Mr. Thomas Horncastle Marshall.

The Clerkships to the Magistrates at Edmonton (Middlesex), Waltham Abbey (Essex), and Cheshunt (Herts), have become vacant by the death of Mr. Joseph Frederick Jessopp, of Waltham Abbey.

Parliament and Legislation.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Feb. 22.—PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION ON RAILWAYS.

LORD REDESDALE called attention to the state of the law in regard to the liability of railway companies to provide proper accommodation for different classes of passengers. Any company might say it would in future carry none but third-class passengers, or it might even go the length of referring all its passengers to cattle trucks or goods waggons. He thought the time had arrived when there should be some legislation to define the limits of discretion which should be allowed to companies in reference to arrangements in which the travelling public were concerned.—The Duke of RICHMOND pointed out that each company's Act obliged the company to run one parliamentary train each way daily.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following resolutions were agreed to:—"That this House will not receive any petition for a private Bill after Friday, the 19th of March next, unless such private Bill shall have been approved by the Court of Chancery; nor any petition for a private Bill approved by the Court of Chancery after Tuesday, the 4th day of May next. That this House will not receive any report from the judges upon petitions presented to this House for private Bills after Tuesday, the 4th day of May next."

Feb. 23.—JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that in introducing this measure he stated that he proposed to repeal the schedule to the Judicature Act of 1873, which contained the rules as to the practice of the court, and that he proposed to incorporate the contents of that schedule along with the rules made by the judges last year, and submitted to her Majesty in Council. As misconceptions had arisen, he wished to state that the only object he had in view was that the body of the profession should not be obliged to resort to two different compilations of rules for the purpose of ascertaining the procedure of the Act. His only apprehension was lest the Statute-book should be needlessly loaded with so great a body of matter which might be changed by the courts after the Act came into operation. If changes were made by the judges these rules, although published in the schedule, would become useless. He doubted whether it was wise to load the Statute-book with such a body of matter, but it was indifferent to him whether it was placed in the schedule or treated as a separate body of rules. There could be nothing further from his mind than to suppose that such a body of rules ought not to be brought under the notice of Parliament and the public in sufficient time before the Act came into operation.—The Earl of HARROWBY said a strong feeling existed as to the continuance of the jurisdiction of their lordships' house as the final Court of Appeal. The opposition to the proposal had gained ground, but not a single petition had been presented in favour of the proposed change, and no complaints of delay had been made by suitors. He hoped that an opportunity would be taken to pass the matter again in review.—LORD SELBORNE said it would be for the convenience of their lordships that before the time came for ask-

ing the decision of the House a clear statement should be prepared by those who opposed the removal of the jurisdiction of that House as to the precise proposal that ought to be adopted in regard to the future mode of providing against those difficulties, the existence of which had been felt for a series of years, and had led to the passing of the Act of 1873.—LORD PENZANCE said the decision arrived at when their lordships were asked to pass the Bill of 1873 was wholly different from that now before them. The question then concerned England alone, and their lordships had no alternative. No one would say that for the mere purpose of dealing with English appeals they should create a second Court of Appeal. But they were now asked to deal with Scotland and Ireland; and the Bill provided that there should be a second appeal. The question now, for the first time, arose, what that second appeal should be. The Supreme Court was to be an Imperial tribunal; but while there was to be a limitation of amount upon appeals coming from Scotland, and while the appeals from England were to be restricted to cases in which the judges in the First Appeal Court had differed in opinion, or cases in which the judgment of the court below had been reversed, there was to be no limitation and no restriction upon appeals from Ireland. He had never heard a reason for this distinction. Then the court itself was constituted in the most arbitrary manner; it was the fraction of another court; and the upper half was to review the decisions of the lower half. The judges of the upper half were to have the same standing, emolument, and dignity as the judges of the lower half; that was a condition of things that could hardly be satisfactory to suitors. Further, the upper half was not to be a permanent Court of Appeal, which, recruited from judges from Scotland and Ireland, might become conversant with the laws of those countries, but at the end of three years, the judges of the upper half were liable to be sent down to the lower half; and this in itself seemed to be a most unconstitutional proceeding, as affecting a judge who had done no wrong. If these difficulties were inseparable from the constitution of the new court, it was all the more incumbent on them to consider whether the old tribunal was not on the whole a more satisfactory Court of Appeal.—LORD HATHERLEY did not admit that the question of a second appeal had any material bearing upon the subject. Before the Act was passed there was a committee of this House which considered every alternative; and the noble and learned lord on the woolsack proposed a scheme which would have saved their lordships' jurisdiction if anything could have saved it.—LORD REDESDALE said it was admitted last year by the noble and learned lord on the woolsack that the new court would not have the prestige of their lordships' House. Those who had brought causes to it were satisfied with it, and desired its jurisdiction to be preserved: and he believed that the preponderance of opinion among the members of the bench and the bar was in favour of maintaining it.—The LORD CHANCELLOR expressed a hope that Lord Redesdale would adopt the suggestion which had been thrown out, and be prepared when the Bill went into committee to explain the scheme he would substitute for the Act of 1873.

The Bill was read a second time, and the committee was fixed for Thursday week.

LAND TRANSFER.

On the motion that this Bill be read a second time, LORD SELBORNE said that the Bill which he introduced in 1873 was greatly improved in the last session. The Bill had also undergone similar improvement—more, perhaps, in matters of form than of substance. But he would venture to mention one or two qualifications. It occurred to him that the Bill in some respects left that obscure which was clear in the former measure. It did not, he thought, with sufficient clearness express the legal title which he presumed it was the intention to give to every registered owner as against all subsequent unregistered titles. The former Bill was better expressed in this respect, which said that all unregistered interests should be deemed equitable and not legal interests, the legal estate in all cases being in the registered owner. His noble friend, for reasons which he had stated to the House, had thought it right to omit altogether the compulsion clause. And further, in the 21st clause of the Bill, his noble and learned friend had introduced a provision which would enable the proprietor at any time after registration to withdraw the

title from the registry and to put the land back under the old system. After fully considering these changes and the reasons which his noble and learned friend had given for them, he must say that he regarded them with the greatest apprehension and the greatest disappointment. Until you arrived at the point of compulsion, and at the same time made registration irrevocable, you would not lay anything like a sure and substantial foundation for the abolition of the embarrassing and obstructive system of deduction of title and conveyancing. He admitted the system to which he referred could be introduced only gradually and progressively. But if upon every sale of fee simple you required it to be registered after two or three years, you would get a new start from that time forward; and in the course of thirty or forty years the title would be clear. That system would be attended with yearly increasing advantages, and after the lapse of one generation would completely substitute a simple and sound system for one which on all hands was admitted to be complex, unsatisfactory, and productive of public inconvenience. His noble and learned friend had alleged three reasons for making the change which he had introduced—first, that the proposal as to compulsion was not in itself universally applicable; secondly, that it would be scarcely possible to apply it to very small transactions, and lastly that it would render necessary the appointment of district registrars throughout the country, and that there would be great difficulty in procuring the necessary funds for the support of so expensive and large a scale of establishment. As to the objection that the proposal would leave untouched a great part of the land of the kingdom, he did not think it very forcible. If you touched land that was put up for sale, you would deal with a great portion of the land of the kingdom and that which required particularly to be dealt with. And then, with regard to those small transactions which his noble and learned friend had rightly described as being effected without an expensive deduction of title, did not they occur in Middlesex as well as in Birmingham? What reason was there to suppose that there would be any serious addition to the cost of conveyance in connection with small transactions? There would be general rules prescribed for the process of registration, and the proceeding would be so simple that he could not conceive it would involve more than a trifling expense. Another objection of his noble and learned friend had reference to the difficulty of establishing a sufficient number of registries. It would be necessary no doubt to have in London a highly qualified body of examiners, and it might be desirable that some of them should go at times into the country; but their services were not needed in the case of the small local transactions to which he was now referring. He could not help thinking the difficulty was imaginary, for there were at present local registries of various kinds throughout the country which might be utilized for the purpose now under consideration. In dealing only with the registration of possessory titles and of subsequent transfers, the rules prescribed would be so simple, that for his part he could see no reason why existing registries should not be intrusted with the duty. Whether the transactions were numerous or not, the registrars would probably be found ready to undertake the work for the sake of the fees. There were, indeed, respectable solicitors who would do it for the sake merely of the position and credit it would bring them. His noble and learned friend had said that if the system was found to be good, it would be voluntarily adopted, and might reasonably be expected to become general. But this was hardly the right way to attempt a large and important reform in a vicious system. Sometimes it was said that from unworthy and mercenary motives the members of the legal profession who were now engaged in conveyancing were opposed to reforms of this description. No doubt in every profession there were men whose motives were less worthy than those of other members; but, looking upon the profession of the law as a whole, he thought it a highly honourable one, which was actuated by as worthy motives as any other profession in the kingdom. Yet one must take account of the disinclination to change, and the *vis inertia* which always stood in the way when a radical alteration was proposed in a system to which people had become accustomed, and in which they had acquired skill and experience. He hoped his noble and learned friend would reconsider this matter. It was not his intention to move amendments in opposition to the proposals of his noble and learned friend, but he had thought it right to make these

remarks by way of explaining his reasons for having originally advocated compulsion, and because he had a deep sense of the importance of the subject.—The LORD CHANCELLOR undertook that before going into committee he would consider carefully the suggestions which had been made, with the view of removing any ambiguities which might be found in the provisions as to the legal estate, as they now stood. He would not dwell upon the power given by the Bill in its present form to remove from the register land which had once been registered. That was a point which was still open and one which could be settled in committee. With regard to the larger question, he wished to say that it was after great hesitation he had withdrawn the provisions of the Bill of last year which would make the registration compulsory. He had stated on a former occasion the reasons which had led him to that conclusion, and he ventured to think those reasons had hardly been met by the observations of his noble and learned friend. But he would repeat that it was a question which ought to be fully discussed by the House, and he hoped it would be discussed with regard solely to the merits of the case. What he was afraid of was attempting to force registration upon the public in a manner which might excite intense dissatisfaction and which might lead to an effort to get rid of the new system altogether. He thought that the noble and learned lord would find that the substitutes he proposed for the local registries would prove very unsatisfactory. He trusted, however, that the noble and learned lord would raise the question of compulsion in committee, in order to take the opinion of their lordships upon the point.

The Bill was read a second time, and the committee was fixed for next Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Feb 19.—THE DRAFTING OF PUBLIC BILLS.

MR. FORSYTH moved "That a committee be appointed, to be assisted by a legal officer, to whom all public Bills passing through this House shall be referred after they have been read a second time, and again after they have been reported, with amendments, from a committee of the whole House, and whose duty it shall be to report to the House upon each Bill as to its accuracy of language, consistency of provisions, and harmony with existing legislation." He stated that since the reign of Henry III., there had been passed 41,985 Acts of Parliament. Of these, 18,297 were public Acts. In the present reign there had been passed to the end of the last session 4,178 public Acts, and of private and local Acts 8,939, making the total of Acts passed in the present reign, up to the end of 1874, 12,267. We were passing every year about 100 public Acts. Of late years there had been a constant habit of making enactments, not by plain words expressed on the face of the Act, but by referring to other Acts passed in previous years, and by incorporating a portion of preceding Acts, so that you were obliged to go back to those Acts to ascertain what the Legislature meant. There was also this habit—an Act was repealed, not bodily but only a section or portion of a section; and annexed to the Act with which you were dealing you found a schedule which stated that so much of former Acts as were not repealed remained in force, and you had to go back from Act to Act, and even to a lawyer the task was almost hopeless. Take the case of the Public Health Act, passed in 1872. It was for the purpose, among other things, of establishing a new Sanitary Authority, and laid down the powers and duties of that authority. How was that done? By referring to five distinct classes of Acts of Parliament, one class containing five Acts, and the whole making a total of sixteen Acts of Parliament, from which you were to ascertain what were the rights, the duties, and the obligations of the new Sanitary Authority. Another instance was that of the Church Building Acts. He might also refer to the Merchant Shipping Acts, which commenced with the Act of 1854, since which period he did not know how many amendment Acts had been passed. Every one of these said, "This Act is to be taken and construed as one with the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 and all the other amending Acts." He held that the proper way of amending an Act of Parliament on an important subject was to repeal it and to re-enact its provisions in the new Act, with such modifications as might be necessary. He held in his hand a list of twenty-five Acts of Parliament, in all of which blunders had been committed which had to be mended by subsequent Acts, and

not one of those blunders would have existed if there had been proper revision and supervision after the Bills had passed through committee. Before 1856 a Statute Law Commission was appointed. The commissioners in their second report submitted that "the most effectual mode of insuring simplicity and uniformity or otherwise improving the form and style of future statutes would be the appointment of an officer or board, with a sufficient staff of assistants, whose duty it would be to advise upon the legal effect of every Bill," and suggest how it should be worded in order to carry out the intentions of Parliament. In 1857 a select committee was appointed for the purpose of considering this proposal. This committee sat for five days and examined five witnesses, but then reported that, having regard to the approaching prorogation, they were not in a position to come to any conclusion on the subject referred to them. From that day to the present nothing had been done. Mr. Coulson, Mr. Rickards, Sir Erskine May, and Mr. Bellenden Ker were all in favour of some such plan as that he suggested, namely, that there should be a Committee of Revision and Supervision, assisted by a legal officer, whose duty it would be to take care that the language of Acts of Parliament was uniform, consistent, and intelligible. This committee would have no power to enact, but would simply take care that what Parliament meant to enact should be properly expressed. The very existence of this Committee of Revision would make members more cautious in the amendments they proposed.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, without going the whole length of the criticism which had been pronounced upon the present mode of passing Acts of Parliament, felt bound to admit that there was a great deal of foundation for it; but the proposal of the hon. and learned member did not appear to him to be practicable in its present form. If the hon. and learned member withdrew his motion, he (the Attorney-General) or some other member of the Government would ask for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the subject.—Mr. GREGORY suggested that the evil complained of might in a great measure be remedied by a rule requiring that previous notice should be given of amendments to be moved in committee.—Mr. FORSYTH acceded to the suggestion of the Attorney-General, and the motion was withdrawn.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS BILL.

Mr. SCLATER-BODD, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was arranged in five parts. It described the offences prohibited, laid down rules for the appointment and duties of analysts, and regulated the proceedings against offenders. Then there were some special provisions with regard to certain offences, and some important clauses with reference to the new duties imposed on those who were to carry out the measure. It prohibited the admixture with food and drugs of any ingredient injurious to health, or the sale of any article not of the nature demanded by the purchaser, with certain exceptions. It was provided that if articles were mixed, whether in accordance with the custom of trade or the convenience of the consumer or seller, they should be mixed in proper proportions, and it would be for the seller to show that. Under the old Act, the seller of retail articles was obliged to declare orally to his customers if there had been any admixture. It was now proposed that it would be sufficient if a label stating the fact was affixed to the article. A refusal on the part of a dealer to allow samples of his goods to be taken for analysis was made a punishable offence. The dealer and his wife would be admitted to give evidence at their trial. If the defendant in any prosecution produced a warrant of the purity of the article from the person of whom he had bought it, and also proved to the satisfaction of the justice that he sold it in the same state as when it came into his hands, he would be discharged. Proceedings, however, might be taken against the person who had given such a warrant in the event of the article proving to be adulterated. The fines obtained from prosecutions would in future go to the authorities who were charged with the carrying out of the Act, instead of to the police, and it was hoped that this would prove an inducement to those authorities to have the provisions of the Act strictly enforced. There was an important provision that tea should be examined by the customs' analysts to be unfit for human consumption would be forfeited and destroyed. At prosecutions it would not be necessary for the analyst to attend unless his presence was expressly desired, and samples for analysis might be sent

through the post.—After some debate the Bill was read a second time.

COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT AMENDMENT.

This Bill passed through committee.

Feb. 22.—REGIMENTAL EXCHANGES.

Mr. HARDY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it had been spoken of as if it introduced for the first time the system of exchanges. As a matter of fact, exchanges had never ceased to exist from the earliest times, and more especially had come into general practice since the English army had been sent to so many quarters of the world; but exchanges were not effected for the sake of luxury or ease, but a great many of them were based upon other grounds, and grounds which were very important to the service of the country. The commissioners appointed by his predecessor were unanimous in recommending the change proposed by the Bill, viz., to remove the prohibition on paying and receiving money by officers on full pay for exchange.—After some debate the second reading was carried by 282 to 185.

SUPERANNUATION ACT (1859) AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a second time.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Sir H. SELWIN-IBBETSON introduced a Bill to repeal Section 8 of the Building Societies Act, 1874, and make other provisions in lieu thereof.

Feb. 23.—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS ACT, 1868.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved "That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the working of the Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, and to report what, if any, amendments are necessary." He said it was true that the investigation of election cases before the judges had the advantage of despatch, and of being free from any imputation of political partisanship; but in all other respects he believed the Act had been a failure. It placed the judges of the land in continual conflict with popular opinion on political questions, and it allowed their judgments to be the subject of common discussion in that House. That was not a state of things which conduced to the maintenance of the dignity of the bench and the proper administration of justice. The election tribunal of judges having been formed, however, he did not intend to propose its abolition, but merely to free it as far as possible from its present objectionable features. He cited many conflicting decisions on the questions of agency, bribery, and treating, and referred to several points of ambiguity in the Act. If Government did not bring forward a measure to amend the Act, the best course to pursue would be to refer the question to a select committee. If two or more lay members of the House of Commons were associated with the judge we should have, perhaps, the very best tribunal which could be constituted.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Act of 1868 would expire at the close of the present year, and the Government would ask the House to appoint a select committee for the purpose of dealing with the question. The motion was withdrawn.

THE CARRIERS' ACT.

Mr. H. M. JACKSON moved for a select committee to inquire into the operation of the Act of 11 Geo. 4 and 1 Will. 4, c. 68, commonly known as "The General Carriers' Act, 1830."—Sir C. ADDERLEY admitted that in many respects the law required revision and adaptation to present circumstances. On behalf of the Government he assented to the motion.

POLICE MAGISTRATES (SALARIES).

The House went into committee on this subject, when a resolution was passed on which to found a Bill for increasing the salaries of the police magistrates of the metropolis.

Feb. 24.—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LOPES, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that the object of the measure was to remove certain defects in the Bills of Sale Act (1854). That Act gave the holder of a bill of sale twenty-one days within which to register, the effect of which was that within that period a bill of sale was not void against an execution creditor, and the execution was defeated. In fact, that proviso as to the twenty-one days had enabled dishonestly

inclined money-lenders and other persons, as it were, to drive a coach and six through the Act of Parliament. That was done in this way:—A money-lender advanced a sum of money to a man and obtained a bill of sale on his goods as a security. He did not register the bill of sale, but allowed a fortnight, or it might be twenty days, to elapse, and then he took another bill of sale, which he again did not register, but renewed at the end of another fortnight or twenty days, repeating that process over and over again, so that there should always be a bill of sale in force which did not require registration. The legality of thus constantly renewing bills of sale was at one time doubted, but the Court of Common Pleas had, with an expression of regret, decided that those bills of sale were good against an execution creditor, and the Court of Exchequer Chamber had confirmed that decision. The Act of 1854 had consequently become a dead letter against those who understood how to renew those instruments in the way he had described. It was to remedy that defect that the present Bill had been introduced. It would render the non-registration of the first bill of sale fatal to its success.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL hoped that the House would give the Bill a second reading. The second section of the Bill dealt apparently in a satisfactory manner with a difficulty which existed; but the third section, the object of which he approved, would, he thought, require to be carefully considered in committee.—Mr. NORWOOD, as the representative of a mercantile community, thanked the hon. and learned member for introducing the measure. At the same time, he thought the third clause required careful consideration, and he reserved to himself the right of opposing it in committee.—Mr. FORSYTH supported the second reading, but indicated certain defects in the wording of the Bill which would have to be amended in committee. The Bill was read a second time.

BANK HOLIDAYS ACT (1871) EXTENSION.

Colonel RITCHIE moved the second reading of this Bill, On a division the second reading was carried by 90 to 64.

Legal Items.

The inhabitants of Bournemouth are desirous of having a county court holden in that town, and it is stated that Mr. Thomas T. E. Lefroy (Judge of Circuit No. 55) has expressed his willingness to attend there in the event of a new district being constituted.

It is stated that the late and present Attorney and Solicitor-General, who were asked to decide the question, whether the North Wales bar should accompany the North Wales Circuit judge to the Glamorgan Assizes, have decided in favour of the North Wales bar, who will therefore attend at Swansea.

A rumour that Lord St. Leonards died without making a will, says the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, has obtained so much currency that there can be no longer any reason for not mentioning it. It is a fact that the most diligent search has hitherto failed in discovering any will, but two or three codicils signed by Lord St. Leonards have been found.

The London correspondent of a provincial journal affirms that "an association of a novel and remarkable character is in process of incubation, and will be shortly brought before the public. It is the idea of Mr. William Talley, who proposes to form a 'Legal Defence Association,' the object of which will be to provide its members with 'legal assistance and defence to the fullest extent.' It is suggested that members shall be enlisted into the society on payment of ten shillings per annum, whilst in return they are to be afforded gratuitous legal advice and solicitor's or counsel's attendance on their behalf in the courts, civil and criminal, of Berkshire and Buckinghamshire. A set of rules has already been drawn up for the proposed society."

The *Lansing Republican* says:—"A very peculiar case was argued last week in the Supreme Court. It appears that an attorney of this State was also engaged in printing and publishing a newspaper; that upon a favourable opportunity presenting itself he sold out his interest in the

printing establishment; that being desirous of securing an office of some prominence from the people, at an election not far distant, he reserved in the contract of sale, a one-half column in his paper for "advertising purposes;" that he was to have the use of this half column for five years; and that to protect himself still further, he took a chattel mortgage of 5,000 dol. from the vendee that he would not say anything in the columns of the paper detrimental to his (the vendor's) character—or, in other words, would print nothing injurious to him in the practice of law. Prior to the anticipated election, this attorney and former publisher secured the desired nomination. The paper withheld its comments for a considerable time. Finally, upon outside pressure, the editor vented his feelings, and allowed articles to be published attacking the personal character of the candidate, thereby preventing his election. Suit was brought for damages, and failing in the circuit, it is appealed."

At the Nenagh petty sessions on Saturday week Mr. Michael Meagher, coroner for the North Riding of Tipperary, charged two men named Bryan Tracey and James Tracey, with having "wilfully obstructed complainant in the execution of his duty as coroner, at Carrigannah, on the 8th inst., in the holding of an inquest on the body of Daniel Tracey, then and there lying dead, by forcibly preventing the jury sworn and impanelled on the said inquest from viewing the remains of the deceased Daniel Tracey." The solicitor for the prosecution said the latter was brought under the 24th and 25th Vict. c. 100, s. 38; and proceeded to state his client's case, which was, that on the 7th instant Constable Hannigan, of the Beechwood Station, reported to him the circumstances connected with the death of Daniel Tracey. The coroner, assuming that the intervention of his office was necessary, and acting on the report of the constable, went to the late residence of the deceased, accompanied by the constables and a jury which had been previously impanelled. They were refused admission to the house by an immense crowd of people, the two defendants being the chief ringleaders. The chairman said that the Act referred to deals solely with the offence of obstructing a "peace officer" in the discharge of his duty, whereas the office of coroner is a "judicial" one. The prosecution must fail unless it were clearly shown that the coroner had sufficient cause for holding an inquest, as (in the words of Lord Ellenborough) he had no right to "obtrude" himself into any house without just and sufficient cause. After a long discussion the case was dismissed "without prejudice."

At the sitting of the Leeds County Court on Friday week, Mr. Vincent Thompson, deputy judge, said he had that morning received an intimation of the death of the judge. The legal gentlemen present, who knew the late Mr. Marshall personally, would regret to hear this announcement of the decease of one who was always earnest and conscientious in his duties. In the generality of cases the late judge succeeded with great despatch in tracing truth and administering equal justice, and it must be remembered that in a court of that sort he gave twice who gave quickly. It was an important matter to have had for long years a judge who could get through so much work in the manner in which the deceased had done it.—Mr. Ferns, as the senior member of the legal profession present, said he believed that for considerably upwards of thirty years he had had the honour of practising before the deceased judge. Having known something of the late Mr. Marshall at the bar, and a great deal of him since his elevation to the seat which Mr. Thompson now occupied as substitute with so much satisfaction to the public, he (Mr. Ferns) desired to add his tribute to the kindness of heart and legal ability which characterized Mr. Marshall. No man could be more anxious to do his duty in the administration of justice for the benefit of the public.—After a few words to a similar effect from Mr. Pullan, Mr. Lawrence Gane, the only member of the bar present, said that although as a new comer, he had not had the pleasure and honour of being personally acquainted with the late judge, yet he knew Mr. Marshall well by report, and had always heard him spoken of by members of the legal profession and others in terms of the greatest respect. From what he knew and had heard, he (Mr. Gane) was sure he expressed the feelings of his brethren of the local bar when he expressed regret at the death of the late judge, who would, however, long live in their memories on account of his legal learning, great ability, and personal kindness.—

Mr. J. C. Malcolm, on behalf of the junior members of the legal profession in Leeds, expressed full concurrence in what Mr. Ferns had already expressed.—Mr. Ferns suggested that, unless great public inconvenience would result, it might be becoming for the court to adjourn at once for the day on account of the judge's death, as was done in similar cases at the superior courts in Westminster.—Mr. Thompson said that idea had crossed his mind, and his own feelings would have prompted him to adjourn the court; but this might be regarded as an empty compliment after the feelings of the bar had been so well expressed; and besides it must be remembered that here, unlike some of the Westminster courts, a great many witnesses and others were in attendance from a distance in cases of pressing necessity.—The ordinary business of the court was accordingly proceeded with.

Court Papers.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	LORD CHANCELLOR.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	LORDS JUSTICES.
Monday, Mar. 1	Mr. Leach	Mr. Merivale	Mr. Rogers
Tuesday..... 2	Latham	Milne	Farrer
Wednesday... 3	Leach	Merivale	Rogers
Thursday.... 4	Latham	Milne	Farrer
Friday..... 5	Leach	Merivale	Rogers
Saturday.... 6	Latham	Milne	Farrer

	V. C. MALINS.	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.
Monday, Mar. 1	Mr. Holdship	Mr. Ward	Mr. Disraeli
Tuesday..... 2	Teesdale	Pemberton	King
Wednesday... 3	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli
Thursday.... 4	Teesdale	Pemberton	King
Friday..... 5	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli
Saturday.... 6	Teesdale	Pemberton	King

CERTIFICATES OF SALE AND TRANSFER.

Mond., Mar. 1	Mr. Latham	Thurs. Mar. 4	Mr. Rogers
Tuesday.. 2	Merivale	Friday.... 5	Teesdale
Wednesday 3	King	Saturday.. 6	Ward

ORDER OF COURT.

Monday, the 22nd day of February, 1875.

Whereas from the present state of the business before the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls, respectively, it is expedient that a portion of the causes set down before the Lord Chancellor to be heard before the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins should be transferred to the book of causes for hearing before the Master of the Rolls: Now I, the Right Honourable Hugh MacCalmont Baron Cairns, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, by and with the advice and concurrence of the Right Honourable Sir George Jessel, Master of the Rolls, do hereby order that the several causes set forth in the schedule hereunto subjoined, be accordingly transferred from the book of causes standing for hearing before the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins to the book of causes for hearing before the Master of the Rolls. And do further order that all causes so to be transferred (although the Bills in such causes may have been marked for the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins, under the 6th of the Consolidated Orders of this court and notwithstanding any orders therein made by the said Vice-Chancellor or his predecessors), shall hereafter be considered and taken as causes originally marked for the Master of the Rolls, and be subject to the same regulations as all causes marked for the Master of the Rolls are subject to by the same orders; provided nevertheless that no order made by the said Vice-Chancellor or his predecessor in any such causes shall be varied or reversed otherwise than by the Lord Chancellor or the Lords Justices. And this order is to be drawn up by the registrar, and set up in the several offices of this court.

The Schedule.

Armstrong v Hall.	Motion for decree.	1872 A. 77
Griffith v Hartmont.	Cause.	1874 G. 14
Buchanan v Stanley.	Motion for decree.	1874 B. 236
Kensit v Beswick.	Motion for decree.	1874 K. 8
Raynard v Arnold.	Motion for decree.	1874 R. 70
Spickernell v Spickernell.	Cause.	1875 S. 126
Holley v Miller.	Motion for decree.	1874 R. 90

Piliter v Barnes.	Motion for decree.	1873 P. 130
Pigott v Stewart, Knt.	Motion for decree.	1873 P. 61
Sayce v Morgan.	Cause.	1872 S. 110
Montefiore v Gibbs.	Cause <i>pro confesso</i> .	1869 M. 134
Moll v Harvey.	Motion for decree.	1873 M. 153
Benson v Newton.	Motion for decree.	1872 B. 67
Thornton v Synnot.	Motion for decree.	1874 T. 55
Whitaker v Nicholls.	Motion for decree.	1874 W. 213
Simmons v Simmons.	Cause.	1873 S. 35
Turner v Tepper.	Motion for decree.	1873 T. 39
Hall v Tepper.	Motion for decree.	1873 H. 113
Fernyhough v Naylor.	Motion for decree.	1872 F. 13
Lister v Dendy.	Cause.	1874 L. 57
Allen v Nicholson.	Motion for decree.	1874 A. 49
Sheppard v Sheppard.	Motion for decree.	1874 S. 254
Thompson v Underhill.	Cause.	1872 T. 70
Lydall v Belcher.	Motion for decree.	1874 L. 107
Rowe v Simpson.	Motion for decree.	1873 R. 66

CAIRNS, C.
G. JESSEL, M.R.

The Master of the Rolls will not hear any of the above causes before Wednesday, the 3rd day of March next.
R. H. LEACH, Registrar.

COURT OF PROBATE.

NOTICE.

In pursuance of the annexed Additional and Amended Rules and Orders, one of the registrars of the Principal Registry will attend to hear summonses at the Principal Registry, Somerset House, on Monday, the 1st day of March, 1875, and on every succeeding Monday until further notice, at 12 o'clock.

By order of the registrars.

23rd of February, 1875.

[The following are the rules referred to.]

Additional and Amended Rules and Orders for her Majesty's Court of Probate in Contentious Business.

133. All summonses heretofore heard by the registrars at the Principal Registry in the absence of the judge shall hereafter be heard before one or more of the registrars at the Principal Registry during the period appointed for the sittings of the court at Westminster, as well as in the judge's absence.

134. All rules and orders in respect to summonses now heard before the judge in chambers at Westminster shall, so far as the same are applicable, be observed in respect of the summonses heard before one or more of the registrars at the Principal Registry.

135. The registrar before whom the summons is heard will direct such order to issue as he shall think fit, or refer the matter at once to the judge.

136. Any person heard on the summons objecting to the order so issued under the direction of the registrars, may, subject to any order as to costs, apply to the judge on summons to rescind or vary the same.

COURT OF DIVORCE.

NOTICE.

In pursuance of the annexed Additional and Amended Rules and Regulations, one of the registrars of the Principal Registry of her Majesty's Court of Probate will attend at the Principal Registry, Somerset House, to hear summonses on Monday, the 1st day of March, 1875, and on every succeeding Monday until further notice, at twelve o'clock.

By order of the registrars.

23rd of February, 1875.

[The following are the rules referred to.]

Additional and Amended Rules and Regulations for her Majesty's Court of Divorce and Matrimonial Causes.

181. All summonses heretofore heard by the registrars of the Principal Registry of the Court of Probate in the absence of the Judge Ordinary shall hereafter be heard before one or more of the registrars at the Principal Registry of that court during the period appointed for the sittings of the court at Westminster, as well as in the judge's absence.

182. All rules and regulations in respect to summonses now heard before the Judge Ordinary in chambers at Westminster shall, so far as the same are applicable, be observed in respect of the summonses heard before one or more of the registrars at the Principal Registry.

163. The registrar before whom the summons is heard will direct such order to issue as he shall think fit, or refer the matter at once to the Judge Ordinary.

184. Any person heard on the summons objecting to the order so issued under the direction of the registrars, may, subject to any order as to costs, apply to the Judge Ordinary on summons to rescind or vary the same.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

RAILWAY STOCK.

LAST QUOTATION, Feb. 26, 1875.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	114
Stock Caledonian	100	103½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	95
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	44½
Stock Great Northern	100	137 x d
Stock Do., A Stock*	100	153½ x d
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	109
Stock Great Western—Original	100	111
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	143
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	97½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	33½
Stock London and North-Western	100	143½ x d
Stock London and South-Western	100	113½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	79
Stock Metropolitan	100	82½
Stock Do., District	100	33
Stock Midland	100	139½
Stock North British	100	72
Stock North Eastern	100	165½
Stock North London	100	114
Stock North Staffordshire	100	69
Stock South Devon	100	55
Stock South-Eastern	100	117

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The bank rate was not changed on Thursday. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has risen from 41½ per cent to 43½ per cent. There was some depression in the home railway market on Tuesday, on the announcement of the Great Western dividend at 5 per cent., as compared with 6½ per cent. for the corresponding period last year, but on Thursday prices were steady. There has been little change in the foreign market. Consols closed on Thursday for money and account 93 to ½.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

ERNST-HALL—Feb. 20, at 16, Norfolk-crescent, Hyde-park, the wife of H. Ernst-Hall, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

HULL—Feb. 19, at 55, Argyll-road, Kensington, W., the wife of Henry Charles Hull, barrister-at-law, of a son, stillborn.

SHARMAN—Feb. 15, at Ivy Lodge, Wellingborough, the wife of Matthew Reid Sharmam, solicitor, of a son.

WOOLF—Feb. 24, at 12, Craven-hill, Hyde-park, the wife of David Woolf, Esq., of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

GREENFIELD—BURDEN—Feb. 23, at the Priory Church, Great Malvern, Thomas Challen Greenfield, of 84, Basinghall-street, E.C., solicitor, to Maria Isabella, second daughter of John Burden, of Ledbury.

DEATHS.

JESSOPP—Feb. 13, at Waltham Abbey, Essex, Joseph Frederick Jessopp, solicitor, aged 43.

MARSHALL—Feb. 18, at St. Leonard's, Thomas Horncastle Marshall, Judge of the Leeds County Court, aged 74.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Bosser, David, and Thomas Phillips, Attorneys and Solicitors, Aberdeen. Dec 29

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Englefield Colliery Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Feb 12, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Nash and Co, Queen st, solicitors for the petitioners.

London and Paris Banking Corporation, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on March 5. Innes and Son, Fenchurch st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Woolen Trade Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 19, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on March 1. Harston, Gresham buildings

EUROPEAN ASSURANCE SOCIETY ARBITRATION.

Athenum Life Assurance Society, Professional Life Assurance Company, General Indemnity Life and Fire Insurance Company, Tontine Life Assurance Company, National Assurance and Investment Association, Life Assurance Treasury, British Nation Fire Insurance Company, Limited:

British Provident Life and Fire Assurance Society: English and Irish Church and University Assurance Society: English Widows' Fund and General Life Assurance Association:

London Equitable Mutual Life Assurance Society, London and Provincial Provident Society, English and Cambrian Assurance Society, Commercial Life Assurance Company, Equitable Provident Institution, United Guarantee and Life Assurance Company, United Service and General Life Assurance and Guarantee Association, Anglo-Australian and Universal Family Life Assurance Company, Homeholders' Life Assurance Company, Engineers' Masonic and Universal Family Life Assurance Company, Catholic Law and General Life Assurance Company, Magnet Life Assurance Company, Accumulative Life Fund and General Assurance Company, Age Assurance Company:

Phoenix Life Assurance Company: Waterloo Life, Education, Casualty, and Self Relief Assurance Company.—Creditors of the above-named companies, societies, or associations in respect of annuities, policies, or otherwise, are required, either personally or by their solicitors, to come in and prove their said debts or claims at 3, Westminster chambers, Victoria st, Westminster, on Friday, March 5, at 1. Mercer and Marcus, Court-hall court, solicitors for the official liquidator.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, Feb. 16, 1875.

Beckett, John, Handsworth, Stafford, Tin Plate Worker. March 11. Beckett v Beckett, V.C. Hall. Grove, Birmingham
Burnmaster, John William, West hill, Wandsworth, Esq. March 15. Burnmaster v Antrobus, V.C. Hall. Freshfield, Bank buildings
Downing, Joseph, Norwich, Dealer in Glass. March 15. Downing v Simpson, V.C. Malins. Sweetland, Lincoln's inn fields
Goodwin, William Hudson, Appleton, Northampton, Farmer. March 19. Perkins v Goodwin, M.R. Gregory, Leicester
McConnell, George, Liverpool, Estate Agent. March 12. McConnell v Houston, at the office of the Registrar, Liverpool District
Paul, James, Bethnal green rd, Baker. March 20. Paul v Paul, V.C. Malins. Voss, Vestry hall, Bethnal green
Rogers, John, Gloucester, Licensed Victualler. March 25. Washburn v Rogers, V.C. Malins. Coren, Gloucester
Stansfield, James, Tudmorden, York. March 22. Ingham v Richardson, V.C. Bacon. Sager, Tudmorden

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Griffiths, William, Mount st, Grosvenor square, Saddler. March 11. Lee v Griffiths, V.C. Malins. Nicholson and Co. Lime st
Henshaw, Rev. Robert Ibbetson Bazett, Lydinch Rectory, Dorset. March 25. Findlay v Coombes, V.C. Bacon. Livingdon, Fenchurch buildings
Holroyd, George Frederic, Bina rd, South Kensington, Barrister-at-law. March 25. Holroyd v Holroyd, M.R. Malleson, Austinians
Mace, William, Crockenhill, Kent, Farmer. March 25. Smith v Mace, V.C. Malins. Gibson, Dartford
Mason, Edward, Datchet, Bucks, Esq. March 31. Blatch v Chater, V.C. Bacon. Darvill, Windsor
Nicholls, John Seymour, Buckland, Southampton. March 22. Chick v Nicholls, M.R. Dangerfield, Craven st
Stirling, Jonathan, Egheld, Middlesex, Market Gardener. March 1. Coutts v Stirling, V.C. Bacon. Rignall, Enfield

TUESDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

Baber, Henry, Weston-super-Mare, Gent. March 23. Williamson v Baber, M.R. Phillott, Weston-super-Mare
Dean, Robert, Peterborough, Northampton, Gent. March 25. Walls v Row, V.C. Malins. Gaches, Peterborough
Dewson, James, Birmingham, Stationer. March 22. Dewson v Barber, M.R. Barber, Birmingham
Foster, Nathaniel Thomas, Wainfleet Saint Mary, Lincoln, Farmer. March 25. Merrill v Morton, V.C. Malins. Bassitt, Wainfleet
Guest, Richard, Bedford, Leigh, Lancashire, Common Brewer. March 17. Guest v Guest, Registrar Liverpool District
Kenworthy, Samuel, Liverpool, Blacksmith. March 25. Kenworthy v Kenworthy, V.C. Malins. Leigh, Manchester
Macdonald, James Horsburgh, Herne hill, Surrey, Lieut Col R.H.A. March 21. Macdonald v Irvine, V.C. Hall. Piew and Irvine, Mark lane
Payne, William, Liverpool, Brass Founder. March 17. Payne v Payne, Registrar Liverpool District
Rabbit, Edward Harris, Forest hill, Kent, Gent. March 23. Pollock v Rabbits, M.R. Sumner, Bridge st, Blackfriars
Rickards, John, Leamington Priory, Warwick, Gent. March 19. Rickards v Butler, M.R. Barrell, Liverpool
Smith, John, Gateshead-upon-Tyne, Durham, Builder. April 1. Smith v Smith, V.C. Malins. Arnott, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Tipper, John, Newmarket terrace, Cambridge Heath, Gent. March 25. Tipper v Solleux, V.C. Malins. Horsley, Jan, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
Underwood, William Ponting, Lower Kennington lane, Messenger. March 25. Underwood v Underwood, V.C. Malins. Ramsden, Leadenhall st

Creditors under 22 & 23 Viet. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Feb. 16, 1875.

Agar, John Charles David, Tenby, Pembroke, Gent. March 15. Dugan and Murton, Bloomsbury square

on for winding
C. Mallin on
for the pri-
ing up, pre-
on March 1.

Insurance Com-
pany, Touline
Investment Ass-
urance Insurance

tion:
on and Pro-
nce Society,
ent Institu-
United Ser-
ion, Anglo-
ny, House-
d Universal
neral Life
cumulative
ance Com.

france Com-
societies, or
se, are re-
n and prove
Victoria st,
nd Mercox,

March 11.

March 11.
March 25.
ng
owning r

• March

Paul, V.C.

434022

March

Interpret

v Macé,

Chlorine

March 1.

2000 年

Welle

A NUMBER

March

PH

yno v

19

ril 1.

build.

1955,

Dub:

Bay, Mary Ann, Warwick st, Fimlico. March 31. Thatcher, Ben
 Bayly, John, Doctor's commons
 Bevan, Charlotte, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol. April 1. Fussell and
 Co, Bristol
 Bizard, William, Earl Stomham, Suffolk, Farrier. March 35. Mar-
 riott and Son, Stowmarket
 Boardman, Mary, Leyland, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 8. Dodd,
 Preston
 Ochoy, Mary, Ovingham, Northumberland. April 1. Legge and
 Denison, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Chase, Georgiana Frances, Nottingham place, Marylebone. May 16.
 Davies, Devonshire st, Portland place
 Chillingworth, Joseph, Trimley, Kidderminster, Worcester, Esq. April
 10. Gardner, Bewdley
 Cotton, William, Holbeach, Lincoln, Gent. April 6. Starton, Holbeach
 Cooper, William, West Kinsaid Ferry, Oswest, Lincoln, Sacking Manu-
 facturer. May 11. Sharp
 Dale, John, Marchmont st, Brunswick square, Licensed Victual-
 ler. April 11. Jaquet, Serjeant's Inn, Temple
 Dickinson, William Henry, Sussex rd, Seven Sisters' rd, Commander R.
 N. April 15. Davies, Aberchry House, Sherborne lane
 Dixon, John, Bristol, Gent. March 31. Brittan and Co, Bristol
 Drew, John, Bristol, Plasterer. March 31. Brittan and Co, Bristol
 Ede, Jane, Stonnall, Staffordshire. March 20. Duignan and Co, Wal-
 laseley
 Farror, James Albert Lawrence, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Wine
 Merchant. May 1. Hemming, Cheltenham
 Fennell, Robert, George's rd, Camberwell. March 31. Follett, Bird-
 in-Bush rd, Fockham
 Frost, John, Teddington, Middlesex, Gent. April 17. Thomas, Regent st
 Nottingham, Henry, Swalwell, Durham, Fire Brick Manufacturer.
 April 1. Legge and Dennison, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Harr, Michael, Burgh in the Marsh, Lincoln, Farmer. March 10.
 White and Harwood, Boston
 Hastings, John, Major, Isle of Wight, Esq. April 15. R. H. Veal, Ab-
 beyside, Westminster
 Heale, William, Chorley, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 12. Morris,
 Chorley
 Hughes, Helen, Salford. March 5. Hulme & Co, Manchester
 Kirby, Thomas Freestons, Stanhope terrace, Bayswater, Licensed
 Victualer. March 25. Hilleary, Fenchurch buildings, Fenchurch st
 Lampart, William James, Liverpool, Merchant. March 31. Thorn-
 by and Dismore, Liverpool
 Leckie, Charles Stewart, Vanbrugh park, Blackheath, Esq. March 15.
 Duncan and Murton, Bloomsbury square
 Lowe, Hastler, Bath, Esq. April 10. Inman and Inman, Bath
 Lye, Rev John, Hampton Lucy, Warwick. March 25. Wright, Lea-
 ward
 Mapp, John, Bewdley, Worcester, Gent. March 20. Boulton and Sons,
 Northampton square, Clerkenwell
 Medcalf, William Henry, Puckeridge, Hertford, Gent. March 31.
 Spence and Co, Hertford
 Miles, John, White Lion st, Norton Folgate, Carriage Lamp Manu-
 facturer. March 15. Jones, Spital square
 Mottram, Abraham, Warrington, Lancashire, Timber Merchant.
 March 25. Davies and Brook, Warrington
 Parkinson, Jacob, Watermillcock, Cumberland, Joiner. March 17.
 Brown, Kendal
 Pratt, Charles, Oswestry, Salop, Butcher. April 1. Minshalls and
 Jones, Oswestry
 Robinson, Elizabeth, Houghton st, Newcastle st, Strand. April 1.
 Lewis and Co, Southampton st, Strand
 Burgess, Hannah, Great Tottenham, Essex. April 5. Digby and Co
 Maldon
 Savage, John Francis, Fleet, Lincoln, Farmer. March 19. Cop-
 man, Holbeach
 Shaw, William, Mansfield, Nottingham, Gent. March 31. Bryans,
 Mansfield
 Sherriners, Charles Edward, Southsea, Hants, Gent. March 31. Pearce
 and Son, Ports-a
 Shaddon, William, Shiphay Colleton, Devonshire, Yeoman. May 1.
 Hooper and Woolton, Torquay
 Stevens, Edmund, Farnham, Surrey, Esq. March 25. Potter and
 Stevens, Farnham
 Street, Mary, Kenton st, Brunswick square, March 16. Baker and
 Nairn, Crosby square
 Swethell, William, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Gent. March 11. Jarvis,
 King's Lynn
 Wickham, William, Goswell rd, Wine Merchant. March 25. Shep-
 hard, College st, College hill
 Wilecks, William, Bristol, Innkeeper. May 1. Fryer, Exeter
 Williams, Griffith, Conway, Carnarvon, Plumber. April 1. Minshalls
 and Jones, Oswestry
 Williams, William, Liverpool, Team Owner. March 31. Morris, Liver-
 pool

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Adams, Samuel, Ware, Hertford, Malster. March 25. Giaby and Sen, Ware
 Allford, John Thomas, Kingalad rd, Licensed Victualler. March 25.
 James and Co, Ely place, Holborn
 Almedad, Joseph Tolley, Lawrence lane, Umbrella Manufacturer. April
 16. Price, Sergeants' Inn, Fleet st
 Burgess, James, Kennington rd, Licensed Victualler. April 1. Charles
 Willis, Bedford Hotel, Braham
 Cartwright, Elizabeth, Shrewsbury, Salop. May 10. Wace, Shrews-
 bury
 Durick, Sarah, Sydenham, Kent. March 25. Woodall, Parliament st,
 Westminster
 Garnett, William, Liverpool, Cattle Dealer. April 15. Whitley and
 Maddock, Liverpool
 Gaby, Mary, Lymington, Southampton. March 6. Moore and Jackman
 Lymington
 Hall, Thomas, Batley, York, Woollen Manufacturer. March 25
 Schofield and Taylor, Batley
 Robinson, Thomas, Liverpool, Merchant. April 3. Anderson and Co,
 Liverpool

Hawker, Helen Susan, Keyhaven, Southampton. March 6. Moore
and Jackman, Lyntonton
Kelsey, Joseph, Gunthorpe, Lincoln, Master Mariner. April 10.
Thorney, Kingston-upon-Hull
Hilliard, otherwise James, Mary Ann, Avenue rd, Regent's park.
March 31. Coode and Co, Bedford row
Lucas, Charles Frederick, Stock Exchange, Esq. March 30. Brooks
and Co, Doctors' commons
Marchant, Jacob, Gibson Jones, Bath, Somerset, Gent. March 39.
Simmons and Clark, Bath
Medcalf, William Henry, Puckeridge, Hartford, Gent. March 31.
Spence and Co, Hertford
Moffat, Thomas, Liverpool, Commission Agent. May 15. Whitley and
Maddock, Liverpool
Ready, Christopher, Loughborough park, Brixton, Gent. March 15.
John Pendergast, Commercial rd, E
Rough, John, Camberne, Cornwall, Builder. March 12. Daniel, Cam-
berne
St. Leger, Charles Arthur, Little James st, Piccadilly, Esq. April 7
Darley, John st, Bedford row
Sharp, William Goodhough, Torquay, Devonshire. March 25. Francis
and Baker, Newton Abbot
Shave, Charles, Ebury st, Eaton square, Lodging House Keeper. Feb
23. Newbown and Co, Wardrobe place, Doctors' commons
Smith, George Rigby, Liverpool, Wine Merchant. March 31.
Fremmer and Son, Liverpool
Towle, George, Lymington, Southampton, Captain R.N.
March 6. Moore and Jackman, Lymington
Wakefield, Henry Furey, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Lieut Col H. M.'s 28th
Regt. April 17. Berkeley, Gray's inn square
Wakeling, George, Chelmsford, Essex, Gent. March 23. Meggy,
Chelmsford
Wales, Mary, Lansdown rd, Notting hill. March 8. Rutter and Son,
Finsbury Circus
Walt, Henshaw, Tan-y-Craig, Pontefellin, Carnarvon. April 12
Llewellyn and Champney, Kingston-upon-Hull
Wiseman, Richard, Birmingham, Machinist. March 25. Gifford,
Birmingham

TUESDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

Bartlett, George, Abbotsbury, Dorset, Innkeeper. March 30. Howard
Melcombe, Regis
Bentley, Thomas Alexander, Seaforth, near Liverpool, Metal Broker.
March 20. Haigh and Son, Liverpool
Breton, Rev. Edward Rose, Charnmouth Rectory, Dorset. March 31.
Feine and Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st
Clement, William John, Liverpool, Beereller. March 17. Grace
Liverpool
Crisford, Robert, Whatlington, Sussex, Farmer. March 30. Sheppard,
Battle
Dait, Robert Abram, King Henry's rd, South Hampstead, Gent. April
30. McMillin, Bloomsbury square
Dawson, Annie Forbes, Queen Anne st, Portland place. April 17.
2 Harrison and Co, Bedford row
Fielding, William, Battle, Sussex, Esq. March 30. Sheppard, Battle
Gardner, David, Hessele, York, Builder. April 12. Stamp and Co,
Gillingham, William White, Rochford, Essex, Gent. April 2. Wood
and Son, Rochford
Goldsmith, Joseph, West Hartlepool, Durham, Ship Owner. March
20. Bell, West Hartlepool
Greenwood, John, Bowling, York, Wheelwright. April 30. Lees and
Co, Bradford
Gregory, Richard, Youlgrave, Derby, Gent. March 31. Wailer,
Coleman st
Hall, Ann, Church Lawford, Warwick. March 19. Blachford and
Richard, Great Swan alley, Moorgate at
Hall, Hannah, Newham, Northampton. March 31. Burton and
Willoughby, Darenty
Hindle, John, Rawden, York, Farmer. March 31. Rawson and Co,
Bradford
Holder, William, Granchester, Cambridge, Miller. March 6. Foster
and Son, Cambridge
Knowles, John, Oxton, near Birkenhead, Cheshire. March 31. Davies
and Brook, Warrington
Laing, George Edward, Verulam buildings, Gray's inn, Architect.
April 10. Long, Colchester
Langhorne, Alfred, Melbourne, Victoria, Esq. April 20. Jones, Crosby
square
Millar, Mary, Blomfield rd, Shepherd's Bush. April 10. Braikenridge,
Bartlett's buildings, Holborn
Mullins, Edmund, Newport, Monmouth, Accountant. April 6. Morris,
Newport
Newell, John, John, Croydon, Surrey, Gent. May 20. Jones and Co,
Tooley st, Southwark
Nussey, Anne Elizabeth, Campden House rd, Kensington. March 16.
Fisher and Son, Great Winchester st buildings
Parke, Sarah, Temple Lodge, Hammermith. April 17. Harrison
and Co, Bedford row
Pownall, James, Hoose, Chester, Gent. March 23. Peacock and
Cooper, Liverpool
Price, Ann, Mincing lane. March 23. Briant, Old Broad st
Price, Lewis Williams, Brecon, Watchmaker. April 10. Thomas,
Brecon
Reade, Charles William, Liverpool, Gent. March 23. Peacock and
Cooper, Liverpool
Reade, Thomas, Ansty, Warwick, Farmer. April 16. Dewes and
Bent, Nuneaton
Snow, Raymond, Turin, Nice, France, Colonel. March 31. Cross,
Lancaster place, Strand
Swindin, George, Snowdonhill, York, Farmer. March 20. Dransfield
and Sons, Penistons
Tansley, Sarah, Hanley, Stafford. March 31. Coopers, Newcastle-
under-Lyme
Ventress, Joseph, York, Joiner. March 1. Holthy, York
Wrightson, Isabella, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex. April 1. Barlow
and Co, Essex st, Strand
Yallop, Robert, Kirkstead, Norfolk, Yeoman. April 3. Copeman and
Son, Loddon

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cunliffe, James, Gracechurch st., Steam Ship Owner. Pet Feb 16. Has-
litt. March 2 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Evans, Joseph Thomas, Adamston, Salop, Threshing Machine Pro-
prietor. Pet Feb 17. Fozz. Maccles. March 3 at 2.30Harding, Henry George, Winterbourne Down, Gloucester, Linen Draper.
Pet Feb 16. Harley. Bristol. March 2 at 12Russell, David, Liverpool, Printer. Pet Feb 15. Watson. Liverpool,
March 2 at 2Wilson, Robert Smith, Darlington, Durham, Grocer. Pet Feb 13.
Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees. Feb 26 at 3

TUESDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Conlthard, Christopher, Cavendish rd., Kilburn, Chemist's Assistant.
Pet Feb 19. Roche. March 5 at 11Crever, James, Friday st., Cheapside, Warehouseman. Pet Dec 5, 1874.
Brougham. March 9 at 11Hodgson, J., and Denham, Clement's lane, Lombard st., Merchants.
Pet Feb 20. Hazlitt. March 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Barrow, Isaac, Manchester, Clothier. Pet Feb 15. Kay. Manchester,
March 9 at 9.30Barkhill, Thomas, Haywood, York, Farmer. Pet Feb 18. Rodgers.
Sheffield. March 12 at 2Covi, Henry, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Notary Public. Pet Feb 20.
Walker. Great Yarmouth, March 16 at 12Fellow, Thomas, Redhill, Surrey, Coal Merchant. Pet Feb 15. Row-
land. Croydon, March 5 at 12Hughes, Rees, Tregaron, Cardigan, Pig Dealer. Pet Feb 17. Lloyd.
Carmarthen, March 6 at 12Hilton, Lot, Manchester, Dyer. Pet Feb 18. Kay. Manchester, March
9 at 9.30Wilson, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Builder. Pet Feb 13. Mortimer.
Newcastle, March 6 at 11Wollam, George, Wem, Salop, Innkeeper. Adjourned until March
6 at 11. Peete, Shrewsbury**BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.**

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Knebel, Samuel Frederick, Staining lane, Beadles. Feb 17

Wright, Samuel Digby, Duke st., St James'. Feb 16

TUESDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

Franklin, Berryman, Church st., Spitalfields, Clothier. Feb 18

Paget, Henry Wakeman, West Drayton, Middlesex, Druggist. Feb 16

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 19, 1875.

Adams, Stephen, Sheffield, Boot Maker. March 8 at 12 at offices of
Fennell, St James' st., SheffieldAldrich, George, Manchester, Saddler. March 5 at 3 at offices of
Heath and Sons, Swan st., ManchesterAllen, James Benjamin, Langley, Bucks, Drawing Master. March 5 at
10.30 at offices of Barrett and Dean, High st., SloughArrowsmith, Aaron, Wigan, Lancashire, Wheelwright. March 6 at 11
at offices of Lees, King st., WiganAtkinson, Robert, Gateshead, Durham, Commission Agent. March 3
at 12 at offices of Story, Pilgrim st., Newcastle-upon-TyneBarns, William, Shoreham, Sussex, Journeyman Wheelwright. March
13 at 4 at the Norfolk Arms Hotel, High st., Arundel. Goodman,
BrightonBaum, Godfrey, Regent st., Banker. March 4 at 3 at the Guildhall
Coffee House, Gresham st., Miller, King st., CheapsideBedell, Henry Peyton, Quayle st., Southgate rd., Islington, out of business.
March 10 at 2 at offices of Digby and Liddle, Cress place, Finsbury
circusBell, Henry James, Ash grove, Hackney, out of business. March 8 at
3 at offices of Gash and Co, King William st.Benjamin, Michael, Jewry st., Aldgate, General Merchant. March 2 at
3 at offices of Evans and Eagles, John st., Bedford rowBottom, John Francis, New Basford, Nottingham, Silk Lace Dyer.
March 9 at 11 at offices of Watson and Wadsworth, Weekday cross,
NottinghamBrittain, William James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Fisherman. March 8 at
11 at offices of Jacobs, County buildings, Kingston-upon-HullBunker, John, Plymouth, Devon, Brewer. March 9 at 12 at offices of
Square, George st., PlymouthCameron, Alexander, Newport, Monmouth, Draper. Feb 26 at 12 at
offices of Graham, Commercial st., NewportCarrey, David, Tavistock st., Bedford square, Baker. March 8 at 2 at
31, Alfred place, Bedford square. WilliamsCarrington, Robert, Wrexham, Denbigh, Bookbinder. March 5 at 3 at
the Queen's Hotel, OswestryChirgwin, John, Penzance, Cornwall, Grocer. March 4 at 11 at offices
of Trythall, Clarence st., PenzanceCoward, George Mattison, Preston, Lancashire, Umbrella Manufac-
turer. March 5 at 3 at offices of Forsyth, Cannon st., PrestonCrocker, Anthony, Wembworthy, Devon, Corn Factor. March 2 at 3 at
the Castle Hotel, Castles st., Exeter. Friend, ExeterCusker, Richard, Merrick square, Southwark, out of business. March 8
at 3 at offices of Henry and Curtis, Spring Victoria st.Davenport, Henry, Sheffield, Spring Manufacturer. March 1 at 2 at
offices of Taylor, Norfolk row, SheffieldDavies, David, Aberystwyth, Monmouth, Grocer. March 5 at 1 at
offices of Tribe and Co, High st., NewportDu Cos, Luiz Augusto, Winchester buildings, Merchant. March 4 at
3 at offices of Stebbing, Bucksbury st.Dummett, John, Bethnal green rd., Talford. March 1 at 12 at offices of
Reed and Lovell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.Dyson, De Jamin, Saddleworth, York, Innkeeper. March 4 at 12 at the
Angel Inn, Oldham. Evans

Dyer, George, Victoria terrace, Victoria rd., Hackney Wick, Grocer.
March 9 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basing-
hall st., Newton, Coleman st.

Early, William Henry, Teignmouth, Devon, Working Jeweller. March
4 at 12 at offices of Daw, Jun, City chambers, Gandy st., Exeter

Everton, James, Worcester, Farmer. March 1 at 12 at the Rainier
Hotel, Macclesfield, Worcester. Stratton, Wolverhampton

Fairrie, Edward Hugh, and James Thomas, Harp lane, Great Tower st.,
Lightermen. March 5 at 11 at the Guildhall Tavern. Keese and
Marland, London st., Fenchurch st.

Finney, William Edward, Huddersfield, York, Carriers' Agent. Feb
26 at 3 at offices of Heap and Co, Station st., Huddersfield

Fisher, John Samuel, Godolphin rd., Shepherd's Bush, Clerk. March 6
at 4 at the Eagle Tavern, Starch green rd.

Ford, Thomas Green, Parkfield st., Islington, Baker. March 10 at 3 at
offices of Kelly, Molyneux chambers, Goswell rd.

Forrest, James, Pendleton, Fishmonger. March 5 at 11 at the Church
Inn, Ford lane, Pendleton. Tremewan, Manchester

Fowler, Henry Cole, Rufford's row, Upper st., Islington, Tailor. March
3 at 12 at offices of Buckland, Eastcheap

Gain, Alfred, Edgware rd., Importer of Foreign Produce. March 6 at
12 at offices of Broad and Co, Walbrook. Peacock and Goddard,
South square, Gray's Inn

Gibbard, Peter James, Jun, Binsfield st., Caledonian rd., Brushmaker.
March 15 at 11 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd., Islington

Fenton, Albion terrace, Kingland

Godwin, John; Chippenham, Wilts, Bolting Cloth Manufacturer. March
3 at 12 at offices of Finniger and Wood, Chippenham

Goldsmith, Thomas, Norwich, Merchant. March 4 at 12 at offices of
Rackham, St Giles st., Norwich

Hall, William, Smallwood, Cheshire, Innkeeper. March 4 at 11 at
offices of Latham and Bygott, Sandbach. Bygott, Sandbach

Harris, George, Sulgrave, Northampton, Farmer. March 4 at 11 at
offices of Kirby and Co, Banbury

Hawcroft, Edward, Barnsley, York, Confectioner. March 3 at 3 at the
Royal Hotel, Barnsley. Stocks and Nettleton, Wakefield

Hemmings, Sampson, Morton Pinkey, Northampton, Shoemaker.
March 5 at 11 at the Pomfret Arms Hotel, Towcester. Sheppard,
Towcester

Hill, Jonathan, Congleton, Cheshire, Silk Throwster. March 5 at 3 at
the Lion and Swan Hotel, Congleton. Garside, Congleton

Holroyd, James, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. March 3 at 2 at the
Great Northern Station Hotel, Leeds. Simpson and Barrell

Horton, Thomas, Nantwich, Cheshire, Shoe Manufacturer. March 5 at
11 at offices of Lisle, Nantwich

Horwood, Edward, Yeovil, Somerset, out of business. March 6 at 11 at
offices of Glyde, Wyndham House, Princes st., Yeovil

Houlder, William, and William Washington Houlder, Upper Thames st.,
Chemical Manufacturers. March 8 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House,
Gresham st., Potter, King st., Cheapside

Huckle, Charles, Riggleswade, Bedford, Furniture Dealer. Feb 27 at 1
at the Crown Inn, Biggleswade. Maynard, Clifford's inn

Jackson, Joseph, Hulme, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. March 8 at 3 at
offices of Edwards and Bintliff, Cheapside, Chapel walks, Man-
chester

Johnson, Frederick, St George's st east, Outfitter. March 3 at 3 at
65, Basinghall st. Wood and Hare, Basinghall st.

Jones, John, Caebeychan Liangadock, Carmarthen, Farmer. March 9
at 1 at the Ivy Bush Hotel, Carmarthen. Woodward, Wind st.,
Swansea

King-ford, Charles, and Charles Tomson Kingsford, Corn Exchange,
Mark lane, Millers. March 2 at 12 at offices of Watney, Clement's
lane

Knecht, Charles, Sunderland, Durham, Photographic Artist. March 2
at 11 at offices of Bowey, Fawcett st., Sunderland

Knowles, William, Matlock town, Derby, Journeyman Joiner. March 6
at 11 at offices of Harrison and Co, Beckett Well lane, Derby. Hes-
tall, Derby

Lewis, Richard, Jun, Thornhill Masbrough, York, Grocer. March 10
at 1 at offices of Hovie, Westgate, Rotherham

Lloyd, Edward, Jun, Wrexham, Leicestershire, Plumber. March 6 at 3 at
offices of Shure, Wrexham

Lucy, Layton, Liverpool, Draper. March 4 at 12 at offices of Carruthers
Clayton square, Liverpool

Mason, John, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. Feb 26 at 2 at
offices of Hand, Church side, Macclesfield

McIntyre, Patrick, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Clothier. March 3 at 2 at
offices of Bush, Nicholas buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Merishaw, John, Loughborough, Leicester, Grocer. March 5 at 3 at
offices of Deane and Lickorish, Market place, Loughborough

Mitchell, Clement, Bradford, Manager. March 3 at 3 at offices of Pullan,
Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds

Mitchell, Joseph, Hulme, nr Manchester, Ironmonger. March 9 at 3
at offices of Hindle and Co, Mount st., Albert square, Manchester

Morris, Edward, Penmaenmawr, Carnarvon, Licensed Victualler.
March 6 at 12.30 at the Albert Hotel, Bangor. Jones, Conway

Murray, Andrew, Windle, Lancashire, Farmer. March 4 at 3 at offices
of Leigh and Ellis, Arcade, King st., Wigan

Nicholson, Francis, West Hartlepool, Durham, Butcher. March 3 at 3
at the Regent Hotel, West Hartlepool

Nix, Richard Greenlands, Thorverton, Devon, Baker. March 4 at 11 at
offices of Toby, Castle st., Exeter

O'Callaghan, William Frederick Ormonde, Old Burlington st., no trade.
March 4 at 2 at offices of Davis, Cork st., Burlington gardens

Phillips, Thomas Henry, Featherstone buildings, Holborn, Gas Engineer.
March 1 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Charing cross

Piller, John, Tealdington, Middlesex, Builder. March 8 at 4 at offices of
Edgell, St John's terrace, St James' row, Kingston-upon-Thames

Pinchin, James, Market Landington, Wilts, Builder. March 6 at 11.30 at
1, Queen's square, Bath. Hancock

Prince, John, Preston, Lancashire, General Dealer. March 5 at 11 at
offices of Forsyth, Cannon st., Preston

Pritchard, Walter, Tredgar, Monmouth, Grocer. March 5 at 2 at offices
of Williams and Co, The Exchange, Bristol

Ratledge, Frederick, Northampton, Leather Seller. March 10 at 12 at
offices of Hensman, St Giles st., Northampton

Rawan, George Major, Sheffield, Provision Dealer. Feb 26 at 3 at offices
of Pierson, St James' row, Sheffield

ick, Green,
ue, Basing-
ler. March
Ester
be Baskin
pton
at Tower
Knoes and
gent. Feb
March 6
h 10 at 3
the Church
lor. March
March 8 at
d Goddard,
rushman,
illingdon.
rer. March
at offices
4 at 11 at
4 at 11 at
3 at the
Shoppard,
5 at 3 at
at 2 the
March 5 at
6 at 11 at
Pharmen st,
Tee House,
Feb 27 at 1
8 at 3 at
3 at 3 at
March 9
Wind at
Exchange,
Clement's
March 2
March 1
by. Hes-
March 10
3 at 3 at
ruthers
at 2 at
at 3 at
Pullas,
9 at 3
er
y
at offices
h 3 at 3
at 11 at
to trade
ngdon.
offices of
11.50 at
at 11 at
to 12 at
offices

Richardson, John, Carterways, Northumberland, Builder. March 2 at 2
at offices of Garbutt, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Richardson, Thomas Bridgewater, Queen's row, Bayswater, Builder.
March 1 at 11 at offices of Jones, Chancery lane
Samuel, Henry, Newport, Monmouth, Boot Manufacturer. March 2 at
1 at offices of Gibbs, Newport
Jennels, Lewis, Bath, out of business. March 3 at 11 at offices of Bart-
m, Northumberland buildings, Bath
Scott, Donald, Smirk's rd, Old Kent rd, Journeyman Baker. March 1
at 3 at offices of Hicklin and Washington, Trinity square, Borough
Sharpe, Joseph, Kegworth, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. March 5 at
15 at offices of Dean and Lickorish, Market place, Loughborough
Shaw, Richard, Hereford, Timber Merchant. March 3 at 10 at offices
of Knights and Underwood, Castle st, Hereford
Smith, Esau, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 1 at 1 at offices of
Hewell, Canon st, Aberdare
Stifford, Charles, Bristol, Painter. Feb 27 at 11 at offices of Esery, The
Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
Stanton, George, Erith, Kent, School Board Officer. March 4 at 2 at 3,
Dove Court, Old Jewry
Tavernier, Charles Blount, City rd, Licensed Victualler. March 9 at
3 at offices of Beed and Son, Basinghall st
Tobacco, Thomas, Horton, York, Joiner. March 2 at 10 at offices of
Lavel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford
Taylor, George Johnson, and John Wallden Smith, Manchester, Calico
Printers. March 2 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Man-
chester. Winder
Townsend, John, Tavistock crescent, Westbourne park, Dairyman.
March 2 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Charing cross
Turner, Edward Baginall, Wednesday, Stafford, Fittings Manufacturer.
March 3 at 3 at offices of Ebsworth, Bridge st, Wednesday
Vomanger, Albert Edward, Manchester, Book-keeper. March 5 at 3 at
offices of Gardner, Brown st, Manchester
Walker, Charles, Manchester, Beerhouse Keeper. March 10 at 3 at offices
of Rylance, Essex st, Manchester
Warburton, James, Widnes, Lancashire, Slate Merchant. March 4 at
2 at offices of Harmond and Co, North John st, Liverpool. Linaker,
Runcorn
Wignall, Samuel, Keighley, York, Farmer. March 5 at 2 at offices of
Wright and Waterworth, Devonshire buildings, Keighley
William, John, Carnarvon, Draper. March 5 at 1 at the Dudley Arms
Hotel, Rhy. Jones and Roberts, Carnarvon
Willis, Henry, Kinsham, Worcester, Grocer. March 4 at 11 at offices of
Moore and Romner, Tewkesbury
Wilson, John, Calverley, York, Cloth Manufacturer. March 5 at 3 at
offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

THURSDAY, Feb. 23, 1875.

Adams, Matilda, Walker's court, Little Pulteney st, Glass Dealer. March
9 at 12 at offices of Kemp and Co, Cannon st. Plunkett, Gutter lane
Alcock, James, Worcester, Basket Maker. March 4 at 11 at offices of
Trev, Sans me st, Worcester
Allen, John, Swinton, Lancashire, Grocer. March 11 at 8 at offices of
Smith and Boyer, Brazennose st, Manchester
Baley, George, Gravel lane, Southwark. March 5 at 12 at offices of
Grayson, Hunter st, Brunswick square
Barker, John Alexander, Dishopgate st within, Hardware Merchant.
March 8 at 2 at 3, Walbrook. Elborough, King's Arms yard, Moor-
gate
Betchelor, Edward Ransom, Plymouth, Devon, Sugar Refiner.
March 9 at 2 at offices of Barend and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol.
Brittan and Co, Bristol
Berridge, Stanford, Whittlesea, Cambridge, Butcher. March 9 at 12
at the Queen's Head Inn, Whittlesea. Gaches, Peterborough
Booth, David, Idle, York, Cloth Manufacturer. March 6 at 11 at
Wharton's Hotel, Park lane, Leeds. Dawson and Greaves, Brad-
ford
Booth, William, Carlton hill, St John's wood, House Agent. March
10 at 4 at offices of Yorks, Marylebone rd
Bowland, John Sykes, Doncaster, York, Hostler. March 10 at 4 at the
Arundel Hotel, Arundel st, Strand. Auty and Son, Sheffield
Browett, Edward Ernest, Coventry, Silkman. March 6 at 12 at the
Castle Hotel, Broad gate, Coventry. Minster, Coventry
Burchell, Joseph, Quality court, Chancery lane, Auctioneer. March 3
at 3 at Ridler's Hotel, Holborn
Butcher, Alfred Laverton, Bristol, out of business. March 12 at 3 at
offices of Hobbs, Clare st, Bristol
Butterworth, Alfred, Manchester, Shawl Manufacturer. March 16 at 3
at offices of Chorlton, Brazennose st, Manchester
Chadwick, Jose h, Dukinfield, Cheshire, Manager. March 5 at 11 at
the Commercial Inn, Melbourne st, Salford. Backley and Miller,
Salford
Chambers, Frederick Augustus, Shepperton rd, Islington, Portmanteau
Maker. March 5 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Cheapside
Clark, Alfred, Lincoln's inn fields, Attorney. March 9 at 11 at the In-
corporated Law Society, Chancery lane. Nicholls, Lincoln's inn
fields
Clarke, Michael, Preston, Lancashire, Tailor. March 8 at 2 at offices
of Edelson, Wincley st, Preston
Clarke, Jeremiah, Canham, Oxford, Plasterer. March 12 at 2 at 28,
Pembroke st, Oxford. Cooper, Charing cross
Clarkson, John, son, Middleham, York, Joiner. March 5 at 10 at the
Railway Hotel, Northallerton. Walstell, Northallerton
Cleaver, William, Leicester, Jeweller. March 8 at 3 at offices of Owa-
ton, Friar lane, Leicester
Cook, Thomas, Croydon, Surrey, Draper. March 3 at 12 at 145, Cheap-
side. Wild and Co, Ironmonger lane
Corbett, John, Grafton st, Newport market, Cheesemonger. March 3
at 10 at Wood's Hotel, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields. Hope, John
st, Bedford row
Crock, Thomas, Bolton, Lancashire, Engineer. March 10 at 11 at the
Swan Hotel, Bradshaw gate, Bolton. Rushton and Co, Bolton
Cronhall, William, Ramsgate, Kent, Commission Agent. March 8 at 11
at 1, York st, Ramsgate. Edwards
Duggan, Othman, Manchester, Merchant. March 12 at 3 at offices of
Addishaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
Davis, George Joseph, Birmingham, Tobaccoist. March 4 at 12 at
offices of Fellows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Dawney, Charles, Bath, Somerset, Chemist. March 12 at 11 at offices
of Collins, Abbey Churchyard, Bath
Dewsbury, Charles, Manchester, Tea Dealer. March 10 at 3 at offices of
Leigh, Brown st, Manchester
Dodge, John, Dilton, Durham, Draper. March 8 at 12 at offices of
Hodge and Harie, Wellington place, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-
Tyne
Dunn, Alexander, Birmingham, Joiner. March 6 at 12 at offices of
Stratton and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham
Emden, Thomas Walter Lawrence, Adam st, Strand, Architect.
March 16 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Pass, Pancras
lane
Evans, James, King's cross rd, Mattress Manufacturer. March 8 at 3 at
offices of Lewis, Hatton garden, Holborn
Fenner, Henry, Anwell st, Clerkenwell, Shop Fitter. March 10 at 11
at offices of Kilsby, Cheapside
Flook, Samuel, Bristol, out of business. March 3 at 11 at offices of Clif-
ton, Corn st, Bristol
Fuller, John, Manchester, Boot Manufacturer. March 8 at 3 at offices
of Edwards and Bintliff, Cheapside, Chapel walks, Manchester
Gledhill, Percy Henry Gilbert, Park st, Camberwell, no occupation.
March 9 at 11 at the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery lane. Sher-
wood, King William st, Strand
Groom, George, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. March 8 at 12 at offices of
Hawkes, Temple st, Birmingham
Hanks, Joseph, Great Portland st, Oxford st, House Decorator. March
9 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Ford and Lloyd,
Bloomsbury square
Harris, Thomas, Hereford, Shopkeeper. March 6 at 11 at offices of
Arthy, St Owen's st, Hereford
Henbrey, George, and Thomas Winton Henbrey, Ore, Sussex, Bakers.
March 8 at 3 at the Havelock Hotel, Hastings. Langham and Son,
Hastings
Herbert, John William, West at, Triangle, Hackney, Grocer. March 8
at 3 at 17, Ely place, Holborn. Graham
Hogg, Thomas Parker, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. March 8 at 2 at
offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Holland, Richard Leigh, Clement's lane, no occupation. March 11 at 3
at offices of Lawrance and Co, Old Jewry chambers
Holmes, Edwin, Keighley, York, out of business. March 8 at 3.30 at the
North Western Hotel, Liverpool. Leigh
Jackson, George, Gunby, Lincoln, Farmer. March 5 at 3 at the Red
Lion Inn, High st, Grantham. Cranch and Stroud
Jarman, Thomas, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 5 at 12
at offices of Beddoe, Merthyr Tydfil
Jeoocke, William Lockwood, and Thomas Worth, Metropolitan Meat
Market, West Smithfield, Meat Salesmen. March 8 at 2 at offices of
Lovett, King William st
Jenkins, Henrietta, Edgobaston, nr Birmingham, Milliner. March 10 at
3 at offices of Fitter, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
Jenkins, Joseph, Everton, Liverpool, out of business. March 17 at 1 at
offices of Quelch, Dale st, Liverpool
Jenkins, Thomas, Crasswall, Hereford, Miller. March 6 at 2 at offices of
Corner, High town, Hereford
Jones, John, Elgin rd, Harrow rd, Paddington, Builder. March 8 at 10
at offices of Fisher, Leicester square
Jones, William Edward, Clifton, Bristol, Picture Dealer. March 4 at
11 at offices of Esery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
Jovitt, David, Huddersfield, York, Draper. March 5 at 11 at offices of
Bottomley, New st, Huddersfield
Kent, Samuel, Longton, Stafford, Boot Maker. March 6 at 11 at offices
of Adderley and Marlett, Commerces st, Longton
Kipling, William Thompson, Bedford row, Auctioneer. March 4 at 2 at
offices of Kelley, Great James st, Bedford row
Langford, William, Oldbury, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. March
5 at 2 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
Lingard, James, Manchester, Manufacturer of Tools. March 17 at 3
at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Rylance, Man-
chester
Lloyd, Edward, Sadgley, Stafford, Publican. March 4 at 2 at offices of
Travis, Church lane, Tipton
Low, Thomas, Jagers, Rochester, Kent, Hatter. March 8 at 2 at
offices of Swaine, Cheapside, London
Marks, Kaufman, Salford, Lancashire, Watchmaker. March 5 at 3 at
offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester
Masterson, George William, Cambridge, Dyer. March 11 at 11 at the
Bird Bolt Hotel, St Andrew's st, Cambridge. Ellison and Burrows,
Cambridge
Mawson, John, Leamside, Durham, Tailor. March 8 at 11 at offices
of Folkard, Clay path, Durham
McCall, James, Chesdis, Cheshire, Joiner. March 9 at 3 at offices of
Creeke and Co, Barton arcade, Manchester
McDonald, Archibald, Middlesbrough, York, Draper. March 10 at 12
at offices of Carruthers, Clayton square, Liverpool
Milton, Robert Samuel, Liverpool, Draper. March 8 at 3 at offices of
Hulton and Lister, Brazennose st, Manchester
Milgrove, Augustus George, Cheapside, Commission Agent. March 8
at 1 at offices of Medcalf, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
Mullen, George, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Boot Dealer. March 8 at 3
at offices of Lawson, Villiers st, Sunderland
Neales, Moritz, Liverpool, Tailor. March 6 at 10 at offices of Forrest,
Fenwick st, Liverpool
Neillson, James, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, out of business. March 10
at 11 at offices of Tilley, Norfolk st, Sunderland
Nowell, Thomas, and Thomas Cornfield Harris, Padeswood, Flint,
Colliery Proprietors. March 8 at 12 at offices of Carruthers, Clayton
square, Liverpool
Nuscheler, Mathias Albert, Hexthorpe, York, Engineer. March 8 at 3
at offices of Fisher, high at buildings, Doncaster. Burdakin and Co
Pankhurst, Francis James, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Fish-
monger. March 4 at 10.15 at the Crewe Arms Hotel, Crewe. Steven-
son, Hanley
Parr, Francis Henry, Old Compton st, Soho. March 9 at 4 at Ridler's
Hotel, Holborn. Yorke, Marylebone rd
Parsons, Henry Wright, Aiconbury, Huntingdon, Farmer. March 15
at 2 at the Great Northern Hotel, Peterborough. Digby, Lincoln's
inn fields

Parsons, William, Great Weldon, Northampton, Farmer. March 15 at 12 at the Great Northern Hotel, Peterborough. Digby, Lincoln's inn fields.

Pearson, Joseph Blanchard, Boston, Lincoln, General Dealer. March 6 at 12.30 at offices of Dyer, Church lane, Boston.

Pelley, Albert, Finch lane, Merchant. March 12 at 2 at offices of Turquand and Co, Tokenhouse yard. Mackenzie, Crown court, Old Broad st.

Phoby, George Trevelyan, Southampton, Schoolmaster. March 6 at 12 at offices of Guy, A'bion terrace, Southampton.

Piercy, William, York, Grocer. March 4 at 10 at offices of James, Lendal, York.

Price, Henry William, Swansea, Glamorgan, Merchant. March 8 at 1 at offices of Kemp, Queen chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham. Glascodeine, Swansea.

Reynolds, Morris, Hertford, Shoemaker. March 10 at 2 at offices of Wedlake and Letts, Mitre court, Temple. Foster, Ware.

Richards, Frederick George, Norfolk st, Strand, Manufacturer. March 2 at 4 at offices of Wetherfield, Gresham buildings, Guildhall.

Ridout, John Lemon, Street, Somerset. Builder. March 6 at 11 at offices of Rutland, High st, Glastonbury.

Smeeth, Thomas Nuttall, and Samuel Instone, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Oil Merchants. March 10 at 11 at the Talbot Hotel, King st, Wolverhampton. Fellows, Bilston.

Smith, Robert, Bullington, Hants, no occupation. March 9 at 1 at the Eagle Hotel, Winchester. Shenton.

Speachly, Robert, Beanfort buildings, Strand, Superintendent of Works. March 8 at 12 at offices of Nicholson, Grosvenor chambers, Newgate st, Cheshire.

Stables, William, Jun, Titchhurst, near Reading, Barks, Surgeon. March 9 at 3 at offices of Roale and Martin, London st, Reading.

Stand, Jacob, Halifax, York, Commission Agent. March 9 at 3 at offices of Boocock, Silver st, Halifax.

Stout, George, Cambridge rd, Mile End, China Dealer. March 8 at 12 at offices of Child, South square, Gray's inn.

Tait, James William, Prescott, Lancashire. March 8 at 12 at offices of Williams, Clayton square, Liverpool.

Thompson, John, West Bromwich, Stafford, out of business. March 8 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury.

Trewren, John Thomas, Liverpool, Grocer. March 16 at 1 at offices of Quelch, Dale st, Liverpool.

Tucker, Francis Edward, Plough bridge, Rotherhithe, Oil Refiner. March 6 at 12 at offices of Gilliat, Gray's inn square.

Tuxworth, Philip, Wolverhampton, Fishmonger's Assistant. March 6 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton.

Wainman, Benjamin, Scarborough, York, Farmer. March 11 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich rd, Crewe. Nordon, Liverpool.

Walker, John, Bradford, York, Shopkeeper. March 9 at 11 at offices of Burnley, Queensgate, Bradford.

Wheeler, John, Harbourside, Stafford, Builder. March 5 at 11 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham.

Whitehead, Anne, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Coal Dealer. March 11 at 11 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Willetts, Thomas James, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. March 5 at 3.30 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham.

Wilford, John, Russell health, Worcester, Clerk. March 5 at 11 at offices of Assinder, Union st, Birmingham.

Williams, Elizabeth, Swansea, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. March 6 at 11.30 at the Gore House, Howell, Llanelly.

Workman, Alfred, Cam, Gloucester, Miller. March 11 at 2 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Gloucester.

Yoxall, Thomas Henry, Manchester, Provision Merchant. March 8 at 3 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester.

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 2 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.
SYMONDS INN, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Chancery Bills and Answers
Appeals
Parliamentary Minutes
Books
Pamphlets
Reports
Rules

Catalogues
Prospectuses
Magazines
Newspapers
Circulars
Posters
Handbills, &c., &c.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

PATENT LIGHTNING INK DESTROYER, is manufactured for the use of Merchants, Lawyers, and Bookkeepers, to be used instead of a knife, in order to rectify a mistake or clean out a blot, without any injury to the printer's ink, saving time, and leaving the paper or parchment as good to write upon as before the mistake was made.—Price 1s. per bottle. Sold by stationers.—PERRY & Co, 37, Red Lion-square, and 3, Cheapside.

STOOPING HABITS, ROUND SHOULDERS,

PIGEON CHESTS, and other Deformities, are prevented and cured by wearing Dr. CHANDLER'S IMPROVED HYGIENIC GIRDLE EXPANDING BRACE, for both Sexes of all ages. It strengthens the voice and lungs, relieves indigestion, pains in the chest and back, and is especially recommended to children for assisting the growth, promoting health and symmetry of figure, superseding the use of braces and stays. Price from 10s. 6d. each.—69, Berners-street, Oxford-street, W. Illustrated circulars forwarded.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.

Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Duncannon. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June 18, 1866, 440 page.

The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.

BAKER-STREET.—SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS.—On View, portrait Models of SIR SAMUEL BAKER, Dr. LIVINGSTONE, Mr. H. M. STANLEY, Rev. H. WARD BEECHER, Dr. KENALY, the EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, the Duchess of EDINBURGH, Sir GARNET WOLSELEY, the SHAH, MARSHAL McMAHON, MARSHAL BAZAINE, M. THIERS, and the late Mr. CHARLES DICKENS. Also, attired in the costume of the period, LADY JANE GREY.—Admission, 1s. Children under twelve, 6d. Extra room, 6d. Open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—THE CHRISTMAS

PROGRAMME WILL COMMENCE ON SATURDAY EVENING, DEC. 19th, and will include a new Operatic Incognity, by the author of "Zitiella," called "THE MYSTIC SCROLL; or, The Secret of Aki Baba and the Forty Thieves," from a highly Educational and Scientific point of view." The Disc Views are from the pencil of Mr. FRED BARNARD. The entertainment by Mr. SEYMOUR SMITH, Misses FERRIS, HUBERT, BARTLETT, WESTBROOK, and Mr. W. FULLEN.—CHEMICAL MARVELS—COOKS AND COOKERY, by Prof. GARDNER.—THE ISLE OF WIGHT AND ITS LEGENDS.—"SCOPES," Old and New, by Mr. KING.—THE TRANSIT OF VENUS.—CONJURING, by Mr. FROSKAUER.—THE MAGIC TUB, Open 12 and 7. Admission 1s.

THEATRE ROYAL, DRURY LANE.

THIS EVENING, at 7.0, REBECCA; after which ALADDIN. The celebrated Vokes Family; Messrs. J. Robins, H. Naylor, &c. Mesdames H. Covey, C. Nott, D'Arcy, Barville, C. Jecks, &c. Harlequinade, double troupe of Pantomimists.

ROYAL OLYMPIC THEATRE.

Sole Lessee and Manager, Mr. Henry Neville.

THIS EVENING, at 7.30, THE TWO ORPHANS: Messrs. William Rigold, Anne Harcourt, Sophie Voltaire, and Henry Neville; Mesdames Charles Viner, Huntley, Harcourt Taylor, Docton, Ernstone, Hazleton, and Miss Fowler. At 7, TWENTY MINUTES WITH A TIGER.

VAUDEVILLE THEATRE, STRAND.

THIS EVENING, at 7.0, A WHIRLIGIG. At 7.45, OUR BOYS. Concluding with, at 10.0, ROMULUS AND REMUS: Messrs. Farren, Thorne, Warner, Bernard, Lestock, James; Mesdames Roselle, Bishop, Phillips, Richards, Larkin, &c.

ALHAMBRA THEATRE ROYAL.

THIS EVENING, at 7.0, THE TWO BONNYCASTLES. At 7.45, WHITTINGTON: Mesdames Kate Sandley, Julia Matthews, Lennox Grey, Grace Armitage; Messrs. Harry Faulkner, J. Rouse, W. M. Terrot, Swarbeck, W. Worboys, Clifton, Paul, Parry, C. Heywood; Misses Pitteri, Pertold, Sidonis; J. M. Dwinne, &c.

75.

7.

edine

un.

ained

CER-

CIAL

Com-

7544-

, is

ook-

er

an,

five

2-2-

ES.

and

EST

the

d to

ing

and

see

2

—

Comp

der,

and

ences

with

plied

1944,

as in

ON,

law,

.H.

the

ST

LAL

MS.

7.-

pen

AS

ing,

hor

At

sa-

es-

AL-

HE

ov.

Mr.

—

The

and

de,

—

am

ary

st,

ES

—

rs.

en,

07,

—

is,

ok

st,

st.